

K. G. L. E. D.

Wherein the said articles of belief are moved to be
Schism, or Heresy, and the Protestant Government of
the Church by Bishops is rendered void, and the Substance
of that which the Fathers of the Council against it, is
maintained and settled in very few words.

...the ... of ... in ...

RECEIVED



h
th
ch
P
th
w
A



AN ANSVVER

TO THE

Parochial Bishop's Letter.

SIR,

SEeing the Prelatical Gentleman, unto whom you directed your Pamphlet by way of Letter, could not presume to give you an Answer to it himself, and that he hath been pleased to recommend that Province to me; you will pardon me, to tell you, that howsoever forward you have been, to appear in Print upon that Subject, yet I am of the Opinion, that you had done fully as well not to have meddled with it; for though you seem not to want some Acuteness of wit, yet the judicious and impartial Read-

or may plainly discover some things in your Book, which cannot much advance the Reputation, either of it or the Author, *Viz.*

1st. Abundance of Vanity and Pride, which may be seen by the general Air of your Discourse throughout your Book, and particularly from the *Title Page*, where you call your self a Parochial Bishop, as if you had the sole Title to the Pastorship of the Parish of *Brechin*, whereas (not to mention Mr. Skinner, who hath certainly the only true Ecclesiastical right) you have a Colleague given you by the Presbytery, who hath an equal Title with your self.

2^{dly}. You shew your self to be a Man much of the same Kidney with the Author of that abominable Book called, *The Rights of the Christian Church*, (though I suppose you will not agree with him in all things,) from *Page 121* of your Book, where, while you are endeavouring to prove that the People have a divine Right to choose their Pastors, (which nevertheless we see to be only used as a Sham to advance the power of the Presbytery,) you assert not only the Election of *Matthias* the Apostle, but also of *Christ* himself by the Suffrage of the People. Which (howsoever it may sound with those, whose heads are turned giddy with such Fanatical notions, yet) no true Christian Ears can receive, but with the utmost horror and detestation.

3^{dly}. You take a sad way of managing Controversy, by labouring only to set forth your own Arguments to the best Advantage, never taking notice of those solid and satisfactory Answers, which our Writers have given unto them: And accordingly your Citations are not set down in the Originals, but, after your own manner, in English, colling out an Expression here and there, such as you think may suit your Purpose, without giving the Passage intire or the Connexion of it with the Context. All which shew a manifest

soft Design, not to inform, but to deceive your Reader.

4thly. You suppose that those Testimonies, which seem to favour the Identity of the order of a Bishop and Presbyter, do conclude also against the Apostolical Institution of Prelacy. Which is a very great Mistake; For, as it is unreasonable to suppose that those excellent Men, who were Prelates themselves, should by their Writings put such a Blot upon their own Dignity; so I shall, God willing, shew that those ancient Fathers, who seem to speak most expressly for the Identity of the Order, do yet nevertheless suppose the Apostolical Institution of Prelacy. And so those English Divines, whom you cite for the Identity of the Order, do also plead for the Apostolick Institution of Episcopacy. For they teach, that (though there was originally but two Orders instituted, as necessary to the Being of the Church, for performing the publick Worship of God, and dispensing the Ordinances of Christ unto the people; yet) when the Churches grew numerous, and could not be well ruled by a Multitude of Presbyters acting in Parity, the Apostles found it necessary, and accordingly did actually set up one to be Ruler over the rest, without whose Consent and Authority, nothing of Moment which concerned the Church, could be done, whom we call a Bishop; thereby continuing the same kind of Government in the Christian, which God had before established in the Jewish Church, according to that of St. Hieron in his Epistle to Evagrius: *Et ut sci-amus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de Veteri Testamento; Quod Aaron & filii ejus atq; Levite in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi & Presbyteri atq; Diaconi vendicant in Ecclesia.* That is; And that we may know the Apostolick traditions to be taken from the Old Testament, let the Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons claim to themselves in the Church, what Aaron and his Sons and the Levites were in the Temple. And this (proceeding from
the

the Controversy about the Order, which I leave to Episcopalians to manage with mutual Charity among themselves) I shall endeavour, God willing, sufficiently to shew, while I confirm the Prelatical Gentleman's three Arguments for Prelacy (which you mention) and vindicate them from your Objections.

3^{dly}. In your Citations of the Fathers and ancient Records of the Church, you fall into many Blunders, of which it cannot reasonably be thought that a Man of any considerable measure of Learning could have been guilty ; whereof I have observed the following Number : And perhaps any person of Learning, who should be at the pains to consider your Book more attentively, might find many more : But, I say, I have observed the following Number, *Viz*.

1st. You cite a Number of the Fathers, without mentioning the particular places of their Works, where such Passages are to be found. As those which you cite Page 28 for the *collective* Sense of the word *Angel*, and that Passage of *Isidore Pelusiot* on the *Title Page*. Which therefore we are neither concerned to regard nor answer.

2^{dly}, You sometimes cite the Page without mentioning the Edition, as that of *Basil. Mag. Constitut. Monast.* in the 41 Page of your Book, and *Euseb. Page 33*. Which (seeing the Pages vary with the Editions) is a very considerable Blunder.

3^{dly}, You cite some spurious Books for genuine. as that *de Question. ex utroq; Testament. Pag. 108* Which is plainly a spurious Book, that, in the best Editions, is contained in an Appendix to the 4th. Tom. of *St. Augustine's Works*, but hath nothing in it either of the Style or Judgement of *S. Augustine*.

4^{thly}. You cite some Books, as written by some of the Fathers, which are not to be found among their Works, in the best and most full Editions of them. As Page 132 *August.* on 1 *Tim.* whereas he writes nothing

thing upon that Epistle. Also Page 85. you cite Hilary on 1 *Tom.* 5, 17. and Pag. 89 upon *Ephes.* 4. whereas he writes not a word upon any of those Epistles. It is true, that there are such Passages to be found in those Commentaries, which go under the Name of St. *Ambrose*, which by some eminent Criticks are thought not to be written by him, but by one Hilary a Deacon: But, as no Man cites them under the simple Name of Hilary, so in effect it cannot be done without a very considerable Blunder. And it must be the greater in you, because Page, 40. you cite the same Commentaries (as it seems from another Author,) under the Name of those which are ascribed to St. *Ambrose*.

5thly. You cite *Aretas* Page, 28. who is either not to be found at all among the Ecclesiastical Writers, or at best, must be so obscure a person, that he cannot be mentioned among the Fathers of the Church, without a very great Blunder.

6thly. You mention *Vistur* and *Polycrates*, as Diocesan Bishops, who were Authors of a Schism Page, 7. though they lived and died long before you will allow any Diocesan Episcopacy to have been in the World.

7thly. You mention *Ischyra* Page 61. as one of your Parochial Bishops, though he was by the Council of *Alexandria* (whereof *Hefius* was President) declared to be no Presbyter; *Socrat lib. 1. c. 20* *Sozomen. lib. 2. c. 26* *Spondan. Epitom. in ann. 328*. It is true, that the *Melitanus* and *Arrianus* (who made use of him as a wicked Instrument for the false Accusation of *Athanasius*, having promised to make him a Bishop as the wages of his Iniquity) did give him a Title to the Cure of that Village wherein he dwelt, giving it also the Name of a Bishoprick (that they might acquit themselves of their Promise to him) though it was but so small a Village as had never more

more but one Presbyter before, and some say none at all, it having been only a part of another Parish. But truly he is a person of so sad a Character in the Christian Church; *Socrus. Sozomen. Athan. Apol. 2. Sponian. Epitom. in ann. 331. and 335. Osiand Epitom. cent. 4. lib. 2. c. 17.* that to name him among your Parochial Bishops, must be a very great Blunder.

Schly. You say in the same page, That the little Village of *Nazianzen*, was all the Episcopal See of the famed *Gregory Nazianzen*, which bewrayeth a most unaccountable Ignorance in one who presumes to be a Writer upon the Antiquities of the Christian Church; seeing it is very certain, that he was Bishop of *Constantinople*, which was one of the greatest Ecclesiastical Promotions in the World.

9thly. You are also guilty of a very considerable Blunder *Page 82.* while you tell us, that in the Primitive times they had *Latin*, and *Greek*, and *Hebrew* for their Mother Tongues, and so needed not to be at so much pains as we must be at in studying the Languages. Which Assertion, (though it may be in some measure true, with respect to the *Latin* and *Greek*, yet) is most false with respect to the *Hebrew*, which was a dead Tongue almost ever since the *Babylonish* Captivity; but most certainly altogether after the destruction of *Jerusalem* by *Titus* the Son of *Vespasian*.

But whatsoever your Performance may be, you may be pleased to receive the following Answer unto it.

There hath been so much written of late *pro* and *con*, relating to the Government of the Church, that it may (not without reason) appear to be superfluous to make any new Undertakings to that purpose. But such are the restless endeavours of your Party; to support and promote their abominable Schism, that they leave no Stone unturned for that effect: And particularly they spare not their Paper, but are continually scribbling, and with the greatest Confidence challenging and defying us to answer those things which have been

been many times answered already, without taking any notice of those solid Answers which were given to them, knowing well how far a goodly Confidence will go to supply the want of Reason with many; especially when they want either Means, Will, or Capacity to search into the Bottom of the Cause.

An eminent Example of which we have in your Pamphlet, wherein you talk with such Confidence, and defy at such a rate, as if you had for ever run down and baffled all reasonable Pretences unto that true Primitive Episcopacy, which we assert, according to the holy Scriptures and uniform sense of the Catholick Church of Christ. And therefore, lest those who understand no better, should be apt to think, that your Performance is agreeable to your Confidence, it appears to be necessary to give some reasonable Answer unto the substance of your Pamphlet, that not only you, but all those of your Party, who shall be pleased to read it, may know that we can not only laugh (as you say) but reason too.

As I hate all kind of wrangling and contention, so I am not willing to enter, even into a Paper War, which I find doth rarely end in a solid Peace: But as self-defence is always excusable (and very often laudable,) if the Defender keep himself *intra terminos inculpatae tutelae*; so I have undertaken this Answer (not presuming upon my own strength, but trusting to the divine Assistance and the goodness of our Cause) and have gone through it in the following Pages, leaving to the candid Reader to judge of the Performance as he sees Reason.

And now, before I enter upon this Theme, I think fit to advertise the Reader, that, as he is not here, to look for a full and accurate defence of Prelacy, it not being my Inclination to transcribe the Works of other Men (who have done that to better purpose than I am able to do;) but rather refer him to their Books, and

particularly (if he inclines not to trouble himself with much reading) to that excellent little Book written by the learned Dr. *Monro*, called *An Enquiry into the new Opinions*, &c. or (if he be content to be at a little more pains) to Dr. *Pearson* and Dr. *Maurice's* Books after-mentioned : So I intend not to swell the bulk of this Paper, and render it tedious by following your Method, and tracing you in every thing that you say ; but shall only touch that which is most material in your Pamphlet, by endeavouring to shew. 1st, That the prelatrical Gentleman had very good reason to charge you and your Parry with that Schism which you impute unto us, and consequently to tell you, that, though you have the Similitude of a Church, yet you have no more the reality of it, than a Nest of Wasps have of a good Hive of Bees; as an eminent Father of the Church expresth himself upon a like occasion. 2^{dly}, I shall consider what you say upon the state of the Controversy, and endeavour to set it upon the right Foot. 3^{dly}, I shall endeavour to confirm the prelatrical Gentleman's three Arguments for Prelacy (which you mention) and vindicate them from your objections. 4^{thly}, I shall answer those Testimonies of the Ancient Fathers of the Church which you pretend to bring against the Apostolick Institution of Prelacy, leaving you, for the farther resolution of the Question concerning Diocesan Episcopacy, to that excellent Book which Dr. *Maurice* hath written upon that Subject against Mr. *Clarkson*, and, for what you say against the Liturgy of the Church, to Mr. *Robert Calder's* Defence of it, but chiefly to Dr. *Comber's* Scholastical History of Liturgies.

First then, that the Prelatrical Gentleman had very good Reason to look upon the Presbyterians of Scotland as a schismatick Party, (and upon that head to judge their Ordinations invalid (during their Schism) and their Communion unlawful) I think may be very plain to any who shall consider the Case with an impartial

and unbiassed Mind; yea, that it is one of the most abominable and groundless Schisms that hath ever been in the Christian Church. It is unquestionable that there is a Schism in the Church of Scotland; for every one that hath Eyes in his Head may see that there are different Communion, and (as we use to say) Altar set up against Altar; yea and you expressly declare that you are of a different Communion from us. But then the Question is, on what side the Schism doth ly? I know you impute it to us, but with how little Reason, it is easy for any indifferent Person, who knows the Transactions of the late Times, to judge.

For not to insist upon the common Argument of casting off the Authority of the Bishops, and so rejecting that Principle of Unity, which was manifestly established by the Apostles of our Lord, and continued without interruption in the Catholick Church of Christ for so many Ages, it is plain that the Schism cannot be charged upon us, because we did not set up a different Communion, nor erect Altar against Altar; and that was only done by the Presbyterians after the Restoration of Episcopacy by K. Ch. II.

But you use to tell us that we departed from you, and not you from us; and therefore we, and not you, must be guilty of the Schism. Unto which I reply *First*, That Presbytery was not the Government which was established in the Church immediately after the Reformation (as hath been sufficiently demonstrated by the Reverend and Learned Mr. Sage;) neither is it a matter of great Importance whether it was or not. We confess that it was legally established in the Year 1592. But both the King and the Nation became quickly sensible of the Evils that flowed from it, and so Episcopacy was again legally established, not only by the King and Parliament, but also by a lawful general Assembly of the Church in the Year 1610. It is true that Episcopacy was again abolished, and Presbytery set up in the Year

Year 1628. But that was most irregularly and rebelliously performed and carried on by such Practices as were a Disgrace to the Christian Name: And accordingly when K. Ch. II. was restored to his Throne, he found it necessary, by an Act of Parliament, summarily to restore Episcopacy again, which had been so irregularly and rebelliously thrust out. Unto which Act more than two third Parts of the Presbyters of this Church, with a proportionable number of People, (being weary of the Yoke of Presbytery and of the many Evils, which were partly felt and further threatned from the growing Contentions betwixt the Remonstrators and publick Resolutioners) did readily consent. So that it is plain, you did most unwarrantably depart from us who were the great Body of the Church.

Secondly, I reply that whatsoever may be supposed of our Departure from you, yet it can never be judged to have been of such a nature as might constitute a Schism; for we never dreamed of setting up a different Communion, and much less of tearing out the very Bowels of the Church, out of a pretended zeal for its Government. That was the Work of the Presbyterians, and we had no hand in it. If the King and Parliament, with the greater part of the Church were pleased to alter the Government of the Church to the better, that was certainly their Duty: And though we should suppose (according to the Presbyterian Principles) that the Alteration was to the worse, yet being done by that which was unquestionably the supreme Authority of the Nation, the Duty of those who dissented could reach no further than to testify their Dissent; and so, having given their Testimony against it, to hold them quiet: And to go any farther to raise a Faction to set up against this Act of lawful Authority, was to enter upon a manifest Rebellion, both against the King and the Church. But to proceed yet further, to withdraw themselves from the Churches, and set up a different Communion, must be the making of an abominable Schism.

Schism of the most dangerous Consequence unto the Church of Christ, especially seeing the opposing of Episcopacy, which was the pretended Ground of their Separation, is a thing that involves them in a Separation from the whole Church of Christ from the beginning. As may be clearly seen by any, who will impartially consider the Records of the Primitive Times ; for seeing you deny to hold Communion with us, because our Church is ruled by Bishops ; upon the same account you do renounce Communion with the whole Church of Christ, which for so many Ages was ruled by them, and particularly with that noble Army of Martyrs, the Leaders of whom being themselves Bishops, were the primitive Lights and Pillars of Christianity, and who did cheerfully and courageously offer up their Lives for the Testimony of Jesus. And if any Persons will not hold Communion with those on Earth, we have Reason to think that they shall never be judged worthy to enjoy a Communion with them in Heaven.

Moreover, in those things, which are the pretended Ground of your present Schism, you do not only oppose your selves to the Primitive Church of Christ, yea, and to the whole Church for so many Ages, but also to all the Christian Churches which are at this Day upon the Earth, a few Divines of the Church of *Holland* only excepted, who follow the Measures of their Republick, which hath always encouraged and fomented our *Scottish* Schism and Rebellion. For, that you differ from your Brethren in *England*, is plain from G. R. his Answer to Dr. *Stillingsfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation*. Where he expressly says, that the *English* Presbyterians do not separate from the Church upon the account of her Bishops, and though several of the Protestant Churches Abroad are governed by Presbytery without Bishops (as the Churches of *Switzerland* and *Geneva*) and therefore are obliged to defend the Scheme of their own Government, yet none of them do either condemn Episcopacy, or renounce Catholick Communion with the

the Episcopal Churches; but upon the contrary do condemn those who separate from their own Churches, because of their Government or Forms of Worship; as doth manifestly appear from the Writings of most of all their Divines since the Reformation, and particularly from some Letters which were lately exchanged betwixt the Divines of *Oxford* and those of *Geneva*, wherein the latter deny the Presbyterians of *England* (and consequently much more those of *Scotland*) to be any of theirs. And in Testimony thereof, they desire the Church of *England* may take notice, that when any of their People come to *England*, they will be always found in the Church & not in the Meeting-house. Which Letters were published in Print by the University of *Oxford*, and I remember my self to have seen them.

And truly, as the foreign Protestant Churches were very unwilling to believe that our *Scotch* Presbyterians could be so grossly absurd, as to reject the use of our Lords Prayer and Hymn to the blessed Trinity in their publick Worship (which were the main Points of Difference betwixt us and them at the late Revolution;) so they do altogether condemn their Practice in that particular. And our Country-man Dr. *Burnet* (now Lord Bishop of *Salisbury*) in one of his Letters to the Honourable *Robert Boyle*, giving an account of his Travels to *Geneva*, commends that People as Men of a true Christian Spirit, who are not of so narrow Souls as to remit any thing of their Christian Charity to their Brethren of the Protestant Churches who differ from them in Rituals or Forms of Worship. Of which he gives a plain Instance in the Case of himself and some *English* Men who had retired with him to *Geneva*, and who coming to supplicate the Government for a Freedom to meet together by themselves and worship God according to the Liturgy of the Church of *England*; they did (as he tells us) most freely and readily grant their Request, and for their further Encouragement

ment, told them, that, if their Number should increase, they would give them one of their Churches.

Which shews what a vast difference there is betwixt their Spirit and that whereby our Presbyterians are act-ed, who, out of their fiery Zeal against the Primitive Government and Liturgy of the Church, did fill Britain with Blood from one End to the other, taking up Arms against their lawful Sovereign, divesting him of his Crown and Dignity, and delivering him up bound to the other Sectaries who barbarously murdered him, embruing their wicked Hands in his Sacred Blood, and forcing his Children to flee for their Safety to Popish Countries, the true Original of all these Evils which since that time have befallen those Nations. *Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum; So much Evil could Religion persuade Men unto.* But surely such a Religion (whatsoever its pretences might be) could not be the holy, meek, peaceable and charitable Religion of Christ.

By all which it doth plainly appear, that, as by such a fiery Zeal you cannot please God, so in those Things which are the ground of your present Schism you are contrary to all Men.

And truly, seeing Episcopacy was not only the Primitive Government, which was settled in the Church by the Apostles of Christ, (as I will have occasion afterward to shew) but also duly and legally settled among us, it may be justly thought strange how you should have the Forehead to say, that it was never legally established in Scotland by any lawful Ecclesiastical Authority, but only by the Tyranny of the Civil Powers.

But you object, that our Church Government was *Episcopalian*, as being declared to depend altogether upon the K. by a Right inherent to the Crown; and this is a thing which those of your Party never fail to set forth with the greatest Clamour, and in the most odious Terms that can be.

Unto which I Answer, *First*. That though you make this one of your great Pretences against our Government, yet you make no Objection of it against your Brethren in *Holland*, with whom you have always kept a good Correspondence, notwithstanding that their Government far exceeds any thing that can be said of ours upon that Head.

2dly. Though I am not inclined at present to dispute how far that which you object against us, concerning the *Erastianism* of our Government, might go to the justifying of a separate Communion, yet I am sure that Pretence cannot justify your Schism, which was formed (long before that Act of Parliament was made, which stretched the Supremacy to that Height which you mention) when there was no more claimed by the K. but the Ancient Supremacy established in the Person of K. *James VI*. Which (according to the Explanation of it given by B. *Usher* in the Star-chamber in *Ireland* approved by the King and Printed by his Order) contained no more Power in Ecclesiasticals, than what cannot reasonably be denied to the Christian Magistrate.

It is true the D. of *Lauderdale* (who was one of the worst Enemies that ever the Church had) being his Majesty's high Commissioner, did in the Year 1669, by an Act of Parliament, declare, *That the ordering of the outward Policy of the Church did belong to the King by a Right inherens to the Crown*. But that was never consented to by the Church; but, upon the contrary, protested against upon all seasonable Occasions: And particularly, when the Oath called the *Tess* was imposed by Act of Parliament, the Clergy did generally refuse to take it, until the K. was pleased (for their Satisfaction) to write a Letter under his Royal Hand to the Privy Council (which was registred in the Council-books and Printed) wherein he declared that they should not be obliged by the said Oath to renounce any

any thing of that Spiritual Power which did pertain to the Church, or which she enjoyed for the first three Hundred Years after Christ. And I remember, that the Brethren of our Presbytery were so nice upon that Head, that they would not subscribe the said Oath, until it was first insert betwixt it and their Subscriptions, that they did take it in that Sense, and no other. But you say, our Bishops sat in Parliament and voted for the Act. Unto which I Answer, 1st, That I know not whether they voted for it, or not. But I know that one of them (*viz.* Dr. Burnet Archbishop of Glasgow) suffered upon that account. *Answ.* 2^d Though all the Bishops had voted for it, yet that could not have inferred the Consent of the Church, which (according to the constitution of our Government) could only be declared by a National Synod.

But you will perhaps yet say, that, seeing Episcopacy was restored summarily by Act of Parliament, after the Establishment of K. Ch. II. upon the Throne, why might not the Presbyterians restore Presbytery after the same manner, when they had got the Civil Powers of the Nation upon their side again, and so reckon you Schismatics, who dissent from them, as you did them before the Revolution?

Answ. 1st. Seeing the Presbyterians were Schismatics before the Revolution, while they did unwarrantably separate from us, and had the Laws of the Kingdom standing against them, the Turn that was made for them at the Revolution giving them the Possession of the Churches and the Laws, to stand for them again cannot alter the Case; for the Church (as you will confess) is not founded upon the Laws of the Kingdom, but upon the Authority of Jesus Christ. It is true that all her temporal and legal Privileges are only founded upon the Laws of the Kingdom, and therefore we do not deny but the legislative Powers may alter or take away those at their Pleasure: But

ten thousand Laws made against her Spiritual Authority, can neither alter nor diminish it, or else she could have had no Authority at all, during the time of the Pagan Emperours.

Ans. 2. The Schism can never be charged upon the Episcopal Church, because she set up no different Communion, nor erected Altar against Altar : But that (as I said before) was the Work of the Presbyterians, and therefore the Schism must be only charged upon them.

Ans. 3. K. Ch. had very good Reason to restore Episcopacy summarily by an Act of Parliament, because it had been most illegally and disorderly abolished, and Presbytery set up by a manifest Rebellion, both against the Civil and Ecclesiastical Authority of the Nation : Which was never the Case of Episcopacy.

Ans. 4. The Case is very far different betwixt the Restoration of Episcopacy by K. Ch. and the setting up of Presbytery by K. W. For, at the Restoration of Episcopacy by K. Ch. there was no Schism nor different Communion as yet set up in the Church, and all that was required by the Laws restoring Episcopacy, was only a Conformity to the Government of the Church. But when Presbytery was set up at the late Revolution, there was an abominable Schism already made in the Church, which no humane Laws could legitimate. And the Government of the Church was not only altered from Episcopacy to Presbytery, but it was also settled upon the Foot of the Schism, by placing it in the hands of the few surviving Presbyterian Ministers (who were the Authors of the Schism,) and such as they either had already, or should afterward assume unto themselves. So that, instead of removing the Schism by removing Episcopacy, (which was the pretended Ground of it;) upon the contrary, they did more firmly establish it : And it was plain they minded neither the Peace nor Govern-

Government of the Church, but only the setting up of their own Faction ; as was smartly told them in their first general Meeting by Mr. *Alexander Piscairn* one of their own Number, and a zealous Presbyterian. If they had only altered the Government according to the Presbyterian Principles, restoring the surviving Ministers to their Charges, and requiring all the Presbyters of the Church to conform to the Government, (as was done at the Restoration of Episcopacy by K. *Ch.*) there might have been some shadow of Excuse for them. But by this Model of their Government, (having laid a necessity upon all conscientious thinking Men, who were formerly in the Communion of the Episcopal Church, either to condemn themselves, and justify the Schism, or adhere firmly to their former Communion, even though they had been otherwise much indifferent as to the Government of the Church,) they did plainly testify to the World, that they sought not the Good and Peace of the Church, but only the setting up of their own Faction. And that they were resolved at any Rate to maintain the Schism, and to oppress and bear down all who should dissent from them. And, as it is very just with God (in his own time) to defeat so unlawful and unchristian a design ; so in effect there is not any thing that hath so much strengthened the hands of the true Episcopal Church, as this hath done. And, as God hath been pleased hitherto to preserve her amidst the most threatening Circumstances ; so I hope in his Mercy, that he will still preserve her, and at length (when our sins are in some good Measure purged by our Afflictions, and the Measure of your Iniquities filled up,) give her Favour in the Eyes of the Civil Powers, who may restore her to her former Temporal Privileges and set her above the Malice of her Enemies. *Amen.*

In the 24. place then, as to the stating of the
C 2 Con-

Controversy, you say, *The Question is not, whether we shall have Bishops, and Episcopal Government, and Ordination, for all this I frankly yield: But, whether we shall have Bishops over Hundreds of Congregations, or Bishops over one; and whether the Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction shall be intrusted with one single Bishop, or with a Society of them?* And so you make a solemn Protestation, that we may take notice of this State of the Controversy, and tell us, that it is sadly mistaken, and Presbyterian Principles misrepresented.

But this manner of stating of the Question appears to be a plain Design to render the Controversy more perplexed and intricate, that you may find a Hole to lurk in, and hide your self from the Evidence of the Truth; for we contend not, that the Largeness of the Bishops Diocese, is any thing essential to his Character, but only the nature of his Dignity and Jurisdiction above Presbyters. At first when Christianity was planted into Cities, perhaps all the People might meet together in one Congregation; as the Number of Converts were increased, so was the Number of Presbyters also, who had the particular Measures of their Work assigned them by the Bishop. But we do not therefore say, (with Bp. Taylor and some others) that the Bishop was the sole Pastor, and that the Presbyters were only his Substitutes, whom (as they say) he did assume *in partem sollicitudinis*, for relieving him of a part of his Cure and Burden: Nay, but the Presbyters were and are proper Pastors, and have the Oversight of the Flock of God committed to them by the Holy Ghost, *Act. 20, 28*. But the Bishop is their Ruler, and is therefore invested with a Dignity superior to them.

I confess, that the Bishop would indeed have a sad Task of it, if he had the proper Cure of all the Souls within his Diocese: But that doth belong properly to the several Presbyters, and not to him. If he shall be pleased

pleased to take upon him the proper Cure of any particular District, then he acts as a Presbyter. But, as a Bishop, his Business is only to govern the Church, to take heed that every particular Congregation within his Diocese be supplied with a Presbyter sufficiently qualified for his Work, (or with a sufficient Number of Presbyters together with Deacons, if the Congregation be great, and stands in need of them;) to ordain those Presbyters and Deacons with whom they are thus to be supplied; to oversee all and every one of them in the performance of their Duty, that they walk agreeably to their Character, and that they be diligent in the Discharge of that Trust committed to them. And this (if duly and conscientiously gone about) will not only be a Work of the greatest Importance to the Church, but also of very considerable Burden to the Bishop.

So that the Question betwixt us and you is not, whether we shall have Bishops over one, or over Hundreds of Congregations (as you say;) but whether the Church shall be ruled by Presbyters acting in perfect Parity, or having one set over them of a superior Dignity and Jurisdiction, without whose Consent and Authority nothing of Importance that concerns the Church, can be transacted, whom we call a Bishop; and whether he be of a different Order or not from the rest of the Presbyters, it is nothing to the main Controversy betwixt us and you: As the learned and judicious Dr. *Monro* hath well observed in his excellent little Book called *An Inquiry into the new Opinions*, &c. Pag. 23. And though it be true, that those *English* Divines (mentioned by you) who did of old write in defence of *Episcopacy*, have either supposed the Identity of the Order, or prescinded altogether from that Controversy; yet that can make nothing for our Presbyterians, who deny all superior Dignity and Jurisdiction of a Presbyter above any of them.

their Brethren; and contend, that the Government of the Church by a College of Presbyters acting in Parity, is *jure divino*, and that all Prelacy is Antichristian.

I confess, that the Identity of the Order may be of Importance to the foreign Presbyterian Churches, who are under a necessity of wanting Bishops; but it can be no Plea at all to our *Scotch* Presbyterians, who will by no means have any Bishops, but have most obstinately, rebelliously and schismatically opposed and resisted their Governours upon that account. And if the Apostles instituted Bishops and invested them with a superior Dignity and Jurisdiction over Presbyters for the Government of the Church, it is all one thing for those who will have none of them, whether they be of the same or a different holy Order. And therefore to what purpose you should have cited the forementioned *English* Authors (except to amuse ignorant people) I cannot see. And truly, I think it is plain, that the laying the stress of your Cause upon your Distinction betwixt the Parochial and Diocesan Bishop, is no better than a giving of it up.

For 1st, If the Bishops had a Jurisdiction over Presbyters and Deacons (as the Reverend and Learned Mr. Sage, in his Vindication of the Principles of the *Cyprianick* Age, hath shewed to be as clear as the meridian Sun) whether the Extent of their Jurisdiction be lesser or greater, it can make no Distinction of the kind of Government; for (as we use to say) *magis & minus non variant speciem*, the being of any thing lesser or greater, doth not alter its kind. A little Man, of a small Stature, is as truly a Man as a Giant is. The ancient Kings of *Canaan*, whose Dominion extended no farther but to one City and its Villages, were as truly Kings as *Solomon*, who reigned over all the Land. Even so a Bishop, having true Episcopal Jurisdiction over the Presbyters and Deacons of a little City only, is as true a Bishop, as he whose Jurisdiction reacheth unto a whole Province.

Secondly.

Secondly. As to the Reason which you give of the Parochial Bishop's Jurisdiction over the Presbyters of that Parish, *Viz.* Because he had the original Right to be Pastor of it, and so, though he did ordain other Presbyters, yet they could have no Jurisdiction within his Parish, but, while they remained there, behoved to be subject to him; it is but a vain and groundless Conceit, which doth neither agree with Reason nor true Presbyterian Principles; For, as it is advanced without any just Ground or Probation, so, if your Parochial Bishop was no more but a resbyter, his ordaining other Presbyters in the same Parish, gave them an equal Title with himself to the Pastorship of it: For if the Pastorship over the Flock of God be essential to the Office of a Presbyter, it was not in the power of the Ordainer (as you prove in another Case,) to confer the Order, and reserve any thing which was Essential unto it. And therefore we find some ancient Canons declaring, that such Ordinations of Presbyters, as should be made ἀπολελυμένως, or without any particular Cure, to be null and void. But I refer you for the farther Confutation of this Scheme to that excellent Book before-mentioned written by Dr. Maurice in defence of Diocesan Episcopacy.

In the *Third* place then, I come to confirm the Prelatical Gentleman's three Arguments for Prelacy, and to vindicate them from your Exceptions. And 1st, he pleaded that Prelacy being found universally established in the Church, it is impossible that it could ever have been brought into it, without any noise or opposition, if it had not been settled by the Apostles; and we behoved certainly to have the time and manner of its coming in recorded, which is a very good Argument, and all the Presbyterians in the World will never be able to answer it.

Now you say, that Prelacy crept in by piece-meal, as many other Errors have done, and so you mention several

several Steps by which you conjecture that it did come in. And you suppose that several Acts of Councils, which were made against some disorderly Practices of Presbyters, to be so many Indications of the Strugglings which they made for retaining their Liberty against the Tyranny of the Bishops.

But I reply 1st. That, if it should be lawful for Men thus to oppose their groundless Conjectures to all the ancient Records of the Church, there could be no end of Innovations. 2^{dly}, I say, that, as it may be justly doubted, whether any Error of Consequence was ever so universally received by the Church, as Episcopacy hath been, so there is a vast Difference betwixt the creeping in of Errors into the Church, and the changing of its Government; for particular Errors in Doctrine or Worship may be sown by the Devil and his Instruments, as Tares in the Field of the Church, while Men sleep; but it is plainly impossible that such a Lethargy could ever have possess'd the Rulers of the Church, that its Government could have been changed from Parity to Prelacy, without being noticed and opposed, and the Change and Opposition recorded. Was there ever any such thing heard of, since the beginning of the World, among Men? Was ever the Government of the least Republick changed, without any noise or notice taken of it in the World? And can any Man in his Wits then think, that such a thing could befall the Catholick Church (so vastly extended throughout the World) and no Man take notice of it, or move his Tongue against it? Government is a thing which all Men are so much concerned in, but especially the Rulers, that any Person who can really believe that all the Presbyters in the Catholick Church should so tamely part with their Liberty, and submit to Prelacy, without making any Complaint against, or Opposition unto the Usurpation, stands more in need of Hellebore than Reason to convince him,

It

It is unquestionable, that Prelacy was universally settled in the Church before the first general Council at Nice; for, if there was any such remote Corner of the World as *Scythia* exempted (which yet appears to have been only a Monkish Fable, as Dr. *Monro* shews in his forementioned little Book from page 227. And as hath been of late more fully demonstrated by the Author & Vindicator of Mr. *Sage's* Life, yet) I say if there was any such thing, it cannot enervate the force of this Argument. And therefore it is evident, that nothing less than an Apostolical Constitution, could have been the cause of such a Settlement; for there having been no general Council before that Time, and consequently no Authority to enjoin it (except that of the Apostles) unto which the whole Church could find themselves obliged to submit, it was impossible that such an universal Consent could have been caused by any thing but an Apostolical Constitution: For, he who will suppose, that all the Presbyters in the World could by Accident so unanimously conspire together to part with their Liberty, and set up Prelacy in all the several Districts of the Catholick Church, needs make no great difficulty of admitting the *Epicurean* Original of the World, by the accidental Concourse of Atoms; seeing the one seems to be no less incredible than the other.

Moreover, both the time in which, and the Persons by whom you pretend this Change to have been made, do farther confirm the Incredibility of it: For the time was a time of almost continued Persecution from the Pagan Powers, when there were no worldly Honours or Advantages to be reaped from those Ecclesiastical Promotions; so that to desire to be a Bishop, was only to desire to be first exposed unto the Butchery of their merciless Enemies. And can we then think, that Men would be generally prompted by an inordinate Ambition to desire such a fruitless and dangerous Dig-

nity? It is true, we have one Instance of *Diotrephes*, who affected a preeminence in the Church inordinately. But, as that was at a Time, when the Church had some measure of Peace after the Persecution of *Domitian*, so it is but a single Instance; and that of one, who, despising the Apostolick Authority, could not be thought willing to suffer for his Religion; yea, and even that seems to afford an Argument against Parity: For, if there had been no Preeminence already established in the Church, we cannot reasonably suppose that *Diotrephes* should have presumed to have obtained it contrary to the settled Order of the Church and under the Eye of the Apostle St. *John*.

And, if the time renders this Change incredible, then much more the Persons by whom it is said to have been made, those primitive Bishops having been generally Men of eminent Sanctity, whose Zeal was so warm for the Institutions of Christ, that they were daily ready to lay down their Lives, and most of them did actually lay them down for the Testimony of Jesus. And what a strange unaccountable Thing then is it, and how injurious to the memory of those holy Martyrs, to suppose, that at the same time, when they were offering up their Lives in bearing testimony to the Truth, they should, through vain Ambition, labour to change any of the Institutions of Christ? And so the Parallels, which you pretend to give of the sudden defection of the *Israelites* to the worship of the golden Calf, &c. must be altogether impertinent.

But you tell us, that the nearness to the Apostolical Times, was no Preservative from Ambition, as it was not from Error; severals of which you pretend to have obtained an universal Reception for the first and second Centuries.

Ans. 1. I have shewed already how unreasonable it is to suppose that those good Men should, through vain Ambition, labour to change any of the Institutions of Christ, who

who were daily ready to lay down their Lives for them, and truly they were so far from being ambitious, that they were generally unwilling to accept and undergo the Burden of those Promotions, which (as I said before) exposed them to all the Cares and Terrors wherewith the Devil and the World could load them. But 2^{dly}, Though we should be so unreasonable and uncharitable, as to suppose them thus culpably ambitious; yet it was impossible (as I have shewed also before) that all the Ambition and Cunning of Men and Devils could have wrought such a Change in the Catholick Church. 3^{dly}, There was never any Error of Consequence, which obtained any thing like a general (and much less an universal) Reception in the Church, without very considerable Opposition made unto it. And (though it be not much to the purpose we have in hand) I must tell you, that, to alledge any thing of that kind to have obtained an universal Reception in the first and second Centuries, is a piece of the most high and hainous Presumption, it being no less than an accusing of those holy Martyrs, in whose Blood the Seeds of the Christian Church were sown; and many of whom, being acted by the immediate and extraordinary Impulse of the holy Spirit, were the primitive Lights and Pillars of Christianity. For my part, if I were sure that any Doctrine had been universally received in the first two Ages, I should be very unwilling to look upon it as an Error; for I am very sure it could be of no considerable evil Consequence: And as to that which you mention more than once of *Papias* concerning the Millenary Doctrine, you are too rash in your Judgment: For, as *Eusebius* (if he hath not been corrupted) doth plainly contradict himself, compare *lib. 3. cap. 25.* with 39. in the account which he gives of *Papias*, and as it is not to be thought, that *Papias's* Doctrine (which was embraced by the great *Ireneus*) was so gross as it is represented by

20

some; so it might have been justly expected that the Deference which you owe to those great Men, who both of old and of late have been of the Millenary Opinion, should have obliged you to be more modest in that Point; especially seeing some of them are Presbyterians of very considerable Fame. But *4thly*, There can be no Consequence drawn from an Error of Doctrine to a Change of Government; for though the one might have been, yet the other was manifestly impossible, as I have shewed before.

But you pretend to give us a History of the primitive Government, as it was settled in the Church by the Apostles: And so you tell us, 1. *That Christ left twelve Apostles behind him, prohibiting all Superiority among them, one over another.* But what will you conclude from thence? I see nothing can be concluded from it, but that therefore there is no Superiority or Inferiority among Bishops *jure divino*, which we are ready to grant; for I hope you will not say, that those Officers, which they ordained in the several Churches, were not inferior to them, and did not act in Subordination to them: And except you say that (which will by no means follow from your Antecedent) you say nothing to your Purpose.

2dly. You tell us, *It being necessary the Apostles should disperse themselves throughout the World, they ordained a competent Number of Pastors to succeed them at Jerusalem, who are called indifferently Presbyters or Bishops: Those, according to the Apostles pattern, continued to act in Equality and in a Presbytery together.*

Now, all this is very easily said, and perhaps may be as easily believed by some of your own Party, though there be not the least ground of Probability or shadow of Truth in it. For, although I do not remember that those Church Officers, which the Apostles ordained and left behind them at Jerusalem, are ever called Bishops; yet I confess, that Presbyters are some-

sometimes called Bishops, and Bishops Presbyters; from which the utmost that can be concluded, is the Identity of the Order, which (as I shewed before) can give no advantage to our *Scotch* Presbyterians. I doubt not but the Apostles, at their Dispersion, left behind them a considerable Number of Church Officers at *Jerusalem*; for the many thousands, which were converted to the Christian Faith in that City, did necessarily require it. But who told you that they acted in Equality and in a Presbytery together? I know you say it may be gathered from *Act. 11. 22, 29, 30.* But it seems you have a better Faculty of gathering than others have: For my part, I cannot gather any such thing from the words of the Sacred Historian; for *v. 22.* it is said, that *the Church which was at Jerusalem sent forth Barnabas, &c.* Where you say we read of Presbyters acting in Parity together about Church Affairs, without any mention of a Bishop among them. But I say, if there be no mention of a Bishop there, so neither is there of a Presbyter. Now, if you guess that there were Presbyters, why may not I guess as well that there were Apostles or a Bishop among them; for I am sure the word *Church* will sufficiently comprehend all: And we have more than one of the Apostles said to be there in the Beginning of the next Chapter. And if they were there, do you think that the Presbyters of *Jerusalem* acted in Parity with them? If you think so, I hope few reasonable Men will think with you. If a Popish Council should send forth some of their Clergy to the *East Indies* to convert Infidels, or to confirm those who are already converted, and this were recorded of them by some Historian, without making any mention of the Pope or his Legates, would any Man be so foolish as to conclude, that they had acted in Parity without any dependance upon the Pope and his Legates? And I must say, that your Conclusion is no better founded. And then

then in the 29 and 30 *Verses*, we have only a Narration of the Disciples sending their Charity, every Man according to his Ability, for relief of the poor Brethren which were in *Judea*, by the hands of *Barnabas* and *Saul*. And how that could amount unto any authoritative Act, whether in Parity or Imparity, I cannot see. It is true, it is said, that they determined to do this (in the *Greek* *ὑπόστασις*) which will import no more but a joint Resolution. Such a matter was not the proper Object of a judicial Act: And though that should be supposed; yet it is plain, that there were Apostles among them, and so no Parity.

Again you tell us, the same thing is clear from *Act*. 15. 4. But, if you can see such a thing clearly there, I must say, that either you are a very sharp-sighted Gentleman, or else I am very blind, who can see nothing like it at all. The words of *St. Luke* are, *and when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the Church, and of the Apostles, and Elders*. Where, I think, he would stand in need of the Eyes of a *Lynx*, who can see any thing like Presbytery; For whatsoever this Act of receiving may import, it is ridiculous to say, that the Apostles and Elders, and the Body of the Church had an equal Authority in it. For this were to level all Authority, and to establish a Democracy in the Church. And to say, because the Apostles and Elders are joined together in this Act, therefore they acted in Parity, is certainly a very bad Consequence, seeing it is unquestionable that the Apostles, while they lived, had an Authority superior to all other Church Officers.

And then, as to that place *Act*. 21. from v. 18. to 25. it affords a much better argument for Prelacy than against it: For it is said, that *Paul came in to James and all the Elders were present*; and so *James* and his Presbyters gave the following Advice to *St. Paul*. Where we have *James*, who was Bishop at *Jerusalem*, plainly

(31)

plainly distinguished from the rest of the Elders, and so the Bishop and his Synod of Elders acting indeed jointly, but with a due Subordination; for if *James* had not been invested with a Dignity superior to the rest of the Elders, why should it have been said that *Paul* came to him, and all the Elders were present with him? This Passage therefore is so far from favouring Presbytery, that, upon the contrary, we have in it a plain Indication of the Prelacy of *St. James*.

Again you tell us, that *Act. 15. We have a Synod about some extraordinary Affairs convened in Jerusalem, which consisted of Apostles and Presbyters and Brethren; and in this Synod we find the Presbyters acting in Parity with the Apostles, for a Pattern to Church Judicatories in all time coming.*

Ans. We are content that the first Apostolical Council at *Jerusalem* should be a Pattern to Church Judicatories in all time coming; for the Apostles and Elders are manifestly the persons of whom that Judicatory did consist. It seems indeed, that some of the most eminent of the Brethren were present, and approved what was done by the Apostles and Elders, for the greater Solemnity of the Action: But there is not the least step to be found of their being concerned in the authoritative Decision of the Question. For 1st. The Commission which *Paul* and *Barnabas* received, was only to consult the Apostles and Elders, *v. 2.* and then *v. 6.* it is only said, that the Apostles and Elders came together to consider of that Matter. It is true, that, after the Decision of the Question, the Consent of the Brethren and the whole Church is brought in to render the Act more solemn; but we find no Body authoritatively concerned in the Action, except only the Apostles and Elders: Neither can we think that the Elders acted in Parity with, but in a due Subordination to the Apostles, whom therefore we find to be only particularly mentioned in the Transaction; and at length

length *St. James*, as President, pronouncing the definitive Sentence, v. 13. And though we should grant that the Elders had in that Synod a joint decisive Voice with the Apostles, yet all that could be concluded from it, is only, that all the Members of general Councils should act in Parity; which can make nothing against Diocesan Episcopacy.

But farther, you tell us of several Churches that were planted by the Apostles, and Elders ordained in them to rule them, without any mention of a Bishop set over them, and that judicial Acts were recommended to Church Rulers in the Plural, and not to any single Person, &c. *Ans.* We do not pretend that the Apostles, at the first planting of the Churches, sent Bishops in them; which appears not to have been necessary. 1st, Because the Number of Christians in most of them at the beginning was but small, and so did not stand in need of the Superintendency of a Bishop. 2^{dly}, Because the Apostles themselves were coming and going to them, and even when they were absent kept a kind of Superintendency over them, as appears in those Acts of Discipline which you mention; which, though they were recommended by *St. Paul* to be performed by the Church of *Corinth*, yet it was not only under his Superintendency, but also by his Authority that they were to be done; as we may plainly see from *1. Cor. 5.* from *v. 1.* and *2. Cor. 2.* from *v. 6.* The 1st Church, wherein the Apostles planted a Bishop, seems to have been the Church of *Jerusalem*; and the Reason to be, because of the great Multitude of Christians in it, which required a good Number of Presbyters for their Pastors; for when the Churches grew numerous, having a Multitude of Presbyters in them, among whom (as *Hierome* says) by reason of their Parity, there began to arise Contentions, the Apostles found it necessary to set up Bishops over them to be their Rulers. The plain Steps of which we find in the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, and to the Angels of the seven

seven Churches of *Asia* in the 2d and 3d Chapters of the *Revelation*, as I will have occasion afterward to shew.

But again you tell us, that *St. Paul* called the Elders of *Ephesus*, *Act. 20*, from v. 17. and gave them a Charge in *Timothy's* Presence, without mentioning any thing of his Authority over them, or their Duty unto him; which he could not have done, if *Timothy* had been their Bishop. *Ans.* You have been frequently told by those who have written in defence of our Government; (and particularly by the learned Dr. *Monro* in his Excellent little Book called *An Enquiry into the new Opinions*, &c.) That *Timothy's* being planted Bishop of *Ephesus*, was after all those Transactions, which are mentioned in the *Acts* of the Apostles, even after *St. Paul's* Delivery from the first Imprisonment at *Rome*, for which, if you please, you may consult Dr. *Whitby's* Preface to his Notes on the 1st Epistle to *Timothy*; where you will find the Truth in that particular asserted, and abundantly vindicated from all the Objections which have been hitherto made against it. And therefore it must be plain, that those of your Party, who make use of this Argument, and set it forth with so much Ostentation, as confounding and unanswerable, are either guilty of a great deal of Disingenuity or Ignorance.

And now I think the Reader may have sufficient ground to laugh at your vain Confidence, in asserting, that you have proved Presbytery to be the first and Apostolick Government, which was well known in that Age when Prelacy had no Being; whereas truly you have not brought any thing like a Probation of it, and consequently we must reject that Conclusion which you draw from your vain Supposition against Diocesan Episcopacy. Concerning which I desire that, for your better Information, you may be pleased to read Dr. *Maurice's* excellent Book before mentioned, wherein he hath proved, that it was
E the

the primitive Government of the Church beyond all possibility of Answer.

But then you give us other four Arguments, by way of Syllogism, to conclude against Diocesan Episcopacy, which are all of the same Kidney, sad Sophistical Syllogisms, whose *Majors* carry an Appearance of universal, but really are only particular Propositions, from which no such Conclusion can be drawn. And therefore (it not being worth my pains to go through them all, and take notice of the particular Falshoods that are in them;) I shall only illustrate the Sophistry of the first by an Argumentation of the same kind, thus; The Priests under the Law, which were of God's Appointment, were to attend continually and offer all the Sacrifices for the People, but the High Priests neither were obliged, nor could they offer all the Sacrifices for the People; and therefore the High Priests were no Priests of God's Appointment: Which every Body must confess to be a false Sophistical Conclusion. Those Bishops of whom you speak were mere Presbyters, they are expressly so called, *Act. 20. 17.* and though they be sometimes called *Επισκοποι*, which we translate *Bishops*; yet the outmost that can be concluded from thence, is only the Identity of the Order, which (as I have shewed before) can yield no advantage to the Presbyterian Cause among us: But that there were other Bishops of a superior Dignity and Jurisdiction instituted by the Apostles, as I have shewed already by unanswerable Reasons, in the confirming and vindicating the Prelatical Gentleman's first Argument; so I shall endeavour (God willing) further to demonstrate by confirming and vindicating his other two Arguments from Scripture.

I come then in the next place, to the Vindication of the Gentleman's second Argument for Prelacy, which is taken from *Timothy* and *Titus* being ordained Bishops by *St. Paul*; and here, before I touch any farther

ther upon this Point, I desire the Reader may be pleased to consider how unreasonable it is, that the Conjectures of Men designing to support a Party, should be laid in the Ballance with the uniform Testimony of all the Ancient Fathers and Histories of the Church, who do all unanimously assert, that *Timothy* was Bishop of *Ephesus*, ordained by *St. Paul*, and *Titus* of *Crete*. It is plain from *St. Paul's* Epistles to them, that he ordains them to exercise an Episcopal Power in those Places, and therefore the universal Consent of the Fathers and Histories of the Church concurring to assert that they were truly the first Bishops there, I think we have a very clear Probation of the matter of Fact. And I am sure, if you had as much to say against it, you would triumph strangely upon it.

But you say, *You own that Timothy and Titus ordained and exercised Discipline in those places, but it can never be proved that they did it alone; for though they are directed to ordain Presbyters, to rebuke them, &c. it can no more be concluded from thence, that they had the sole power of Ordination and Discipline, exclusive of the other Pastors there, than it can be inferred that Timothy had the sole power of Preaching in Ephesus, because the Apostle directs him to preach the word, to be instant, &c. 2 Tim. 4. 2.* But the matter is only, *Timothy is written to as the chief Person of the Presbytery of Ephesus, who probably was Moderator and Mouth of the Presbytery while he was there.*

Unto which I reply; It is plain that *Timothy* and *Titus* had the Power of ordaining, rebuking and correcting Elders, and of rejecting those that were Heretical, committed unto them, which is a true Episcopal Power: And so (as I said before) the Testimony of all Antiquity concurring to assert that they were really Bishops of those places, I cannot see how we should need a better Proof for a thing of that kind. And I appeal to the Judgment of the Candid and indifferent Read-

er, whether any Man may reasonably presume to set up against such Evidence, except he could demonstrate the Impossibility of the Facts. And yet all those things which you object against them are but Trifles and Conjectures: For 1st, As to that which you say, that it cannot be proved that they exercised that Power alone in those places, it is nothing to the purpose; seeing the Probation of their having any Partner in it, is manifestly incumbent upon you, for we can never be obliged to prove a Negative of that kind. It is enough for us that the Apostle doth commit such a Power to them, without mentioning of any Partner in it. Moreover that Power, which the Apostle in his Epistles doth commit to them, seems naturally to exclude all Equality in the Partnership of it; for to what purpose should the Apostle have enjoined *Timothy* not to lay hands suddenly on any Man, but take heed that they should be so and so qualified, if any other within that Society could have done it without his Consent, Or, to what purpose should he have enjoined him not to receive an Accusation against an Elder, but under the mouth of two or three Witnesses, if it could have been done by others without him? We do not plead that he exercised that Power alone without the Concurrence of the Presbyters of *Ephesus* (though we suppose it would be hard to prove that he did not;) for we grant that the Presbyters have their own Share of the Government of the Church committed to them, by virtue of their Office; but the Exercise of it is to be still with a due Subordination unto the Bishop, who is their Ruler. And so the Power exercised by *Timothy*, according to the direction of the Apostle, is of a quite different nature from that which is competent to a simple Moderator, or mouth of a Presbytery, as you dream.

But farther you tell us, *That Timothy and Titus were not settled Bishops or Diocesan Prelates in the foresaid places*

places, as hath been proved by many; and you have shewed us before, that Timothy was not Bishop of Ephesus, when Paul took his leave of the Presbyters, &c.

Ans. I have not seen any of those many who have proved that Timothy and Titus were not Diocesan Prelates in those places, and I have told you before, that we do not say that Timothy was Bishop of Ephesus, when St. Paul took his leave of the Presbyters, and have directed you to Dr. *Whitby* for answering of your Brethrens Objections upon that head. And as to that which you say, If he had been Bishop of Ephesus, Paul could not have besought him to stay there in his Diocese to do his work. This had been a tacite Reflection upon him, as if he had been averse to do his Duty; it is but a silly Cavil: For there can be no doubt, but St. Paul might have besought him to take upon him the Office of a Bishop at Ephesus, which was effectually to bid him stay there; and that is certainly the meaning of the Apostle in the place which you mention.

Now I come to the Vindication of the Gentleman's third Argument, which (as you tell us) is taken from the Angels of the seven Churches of Asia, Revelat. 2. those being single Persons or Bishops, which had the care of those Churches, to whom Christ directs his Epistles: And so you answer, imo. Tho' you should yield those Angels were single Persons, yet it would do our Cause no service, seeing we can never prove that they were any more than the Presidents or Moderators of Presbyteries, &c.

Now unto this I reply, that it is plain from our Saviour's Epistles to those Angels, that they were invested with an Episcopal power and Jurisdiction over those Churches whose Angels they were, for they are blamed and threatned for the Faults, and commended for the Virtues of those Churches; which could not reasonably have been done, if they had not been invested with more Power than simple Moderators. And though we should grant that the Title of Angel might
of

of it self (as you say) import no such Power, yet the Angel of such a Church *κατ' ἐξουίαν*, or by way of Eminency (as it is in those Epistles) doth manifestly import it.

But 2^d. You say, *It is evident from those Epistles, that the word Angel is to be taken collectively*, &c. Unto which I reply, that it is strange you should have the Confidence still to make use of this Shift to elude the force of our Argument, after it hath been so often solidly refuted, and particularly by the Learned Dr. *Manno* in his little Book beforementioned, which the Reader may be pleased to consult for his Satisfaction in that particular. But nevertheless, lest it may be thought, that I should pass it over too slightly, if I should say no more to it in this place; be pleased to consider, that though we grant a Word in the singular number may be sometimes taken *collectively*, and so signify a Multitude; yet there is no Parallel to this to be found, either in Sacred or profane Authors: Neither can there be any thing more impertinent than to write after that manner, as you would have St. *John* to do here. As for Example, who would not laugh him to scorn, that should write a Letter to the Alderman of the City of London, or to the Bailie of the City of Edinburgh in the singular number, and yet after this ridiculous manner will you have St. *John* (from the mouth of our Saviour) to write, rather than he should not be thought to favour your novel Opinion.

But you tell us, that the Greek word *ὑμεῖς* in cap. 22. v. 22. *Which is translated You*, being a Plural word, doth confirm the collective Sense of the word Angel; for if the Epistle had been directed to a single Person, John would have said to Thee and to the rest, and not to you. Also you tell us, that v. 10. of the same Chapter, after he hath exhorted the Angel of the Church of Smyrna to fear none of those things which he should suffer, he immediately subjoins; Behold the Devil shall cast some of you into Prison, that

that ye may be tryed; Where the word *You* is also Plural.

Unto which I reply, 1st. That there is not so much as an Appearance of a Difficulty in v. 10. seeing St. *John* there writes not to, but of the Multitude; as if he had said, the Devil shall cast some of your Church or People into prison. 2^{dly}. As to v. 24. If our Reading be retained, (which is not agreeable to the famous *Alexandrian* Manuscript) the Plural word *You* may be referred to all the Churches mentioned in the former ver. and not to the Presbyters of *Thyatira*. 3^{dly}. Though we should grant that the Plural word *You*, may be referred to the Presbyters of *Thyatira*, together with their Bishop, it could be no prejudice to our acception of the word *Angel* in the Inscription of the Epistle; and the utmost that can be made of it, is, That all being concerned in that which was written to the Bishop, St. *John* in that ver. turns his Speech unto them all, to let them know so much: Neither will it therefore follow that the Epistle was not written to a single Person, but only that it was not he alone who was concerned in it; and that such an *Apostrophe* was neither impertinent nor unusual in that Age, we may see from the last words of the Epistle to *Titus*, where, though the Epistle was expressly directed to *Titus*, and the Apostle was speaking to him immediately before, as well as through all the rest of the Epistle; yet in those last words he directs his Speech to the whole Church together with him. And this is also very plain from the Epistle of St. *Ignatius* to *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna* (who was one of those Angels) where we find in the sixth Paragraph just such another *Apostrophe* to the whole Church, though the Epistle was expressly directed to *Polycarp* by Name.

And whereas you say farther, That the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, unto whom the Epistle is directed Revelat. 2. 1. could not be a Diocesan Bishop, seeing it is already proved from Act. 20. 28. that this Church had
Several

several Bishops ruling her in Conjunction, and for those who would make Timothy Bishop there at this time, they do him no little injury in making him guilty of Apostasy, &c.

I answer, that (as I shewed before) those mentioned, *Act. 20. 28.* were only Presbyters, and that *Timothy* was not settled Bishop there for several Years after that time, until *St. Paul* was delivered from his first Imprisonment at *Rome*. And as to the injury which you say was done to *Timothy* by making him Bishop there, and consequently (as you suppose) the Angel unto whom the Epistle was written *Revelat. 2. 1.* I shall not inquire how far this might have been injurious to him ; but truly it will not follow, that, because *Timothy* was constituted the first Bishop of *Ephesus* by *St. Paul*, therefore he was the Angel unto whom the Epistle was directed by *St. John, Revelat. 2. 1.* For *Timothy* having been a tender and valetudinary Man, (as we may see from *1 Tim. 5. 23.*) it is very probable that he did not live so long. We have indeed no account of his Martyrdom, nor of the particular time of his Death ; but we cannot reasonably think that he should live so long as the Banishment of *St. John* to *Patmos*, which is reckoned to have been about the 92 Year of Christ, in the Reign of *Domitian*; whereas the Delivery of *St. Paul* from his first Imprisonment at *Rome*, is reckoned to have been about the 61 Year of Christ in the Reign of *Nero* ; and there being about 30 Years from the settling *Timothy* Bishop of *Ephesus* by *St. Paul*, and the writing of the *Revelation* by *St. John*, we cannot reasonably think that *Timothy* should have been the Angel unto whom the Epistle was directed.

And whereas you farther object, That *Christ* threatens to remove the Candlestick for the sins of the Angel, and we cannot think that he would remove the Gospel from a whole Church for the sins of one Diocesan Bishop ; it is of no moment ; For as there must be but little Difference betwixt the removing of the Candlestick for the Sins of

a Diocesan Bishop, and for the Sins of a College of Presbyters; so (as I have said before) the Angels are plainly reproved for the Sins of the Churches committed to their Charge, as *Revelat. 2. 14, 15.* and consequently Christ doth not threaten to remove the Candlestick from the Church, meerly because of the Sins of the Bishop, but because of the Sins of the Church it self, unto which it is like that the Bishop had some Accession.

But you tell us yet farther, *That those Angels are understood in your Sense by the ancient Fathers, such as Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory, Ageras, Primasius and many others, besides the Schoolmen and latter Interpreters.*

Ans. If those ancient Fathers understand the Angels in your Sense, why do you not tell us in what place or Places of their Works this is to be found? At that Rate any Man may cite as many of the Fathers, as he pleases, for any of his Opinions; but no Man can think himself obliged to regard or answer such Authorities. *St. Ambrose* writes nothing upon the *Revelation*; and I cannot find a word of the Angels of the seven Churches in any part of his Works. *St. Augustine* also writes nothing upon the *Revelation*; and I find as little of those Angels in any part of his Works, except in *Epist. 162.* Where he says, *Divina voce, sub nomine Angelis, laudatur Præpositus Ecclesie.* That is; *By the voice of God, the Governour of the Church is praised under the name of Angel.* Which is a plain Testimony against your collective Sense of the word. It is true there is a spurious Book annexed to the ninth *Tract* of *St. Augustine's* Works, containing some Homilies upon the *Revelation*, (which hath nothing either of the Stile or Judgment of *St. Augustine*;) and there I find the Author saying, that by the Angels the Church is to be understood; and perhaps that is the place which your Author points at. But I must tell you, that (whatsoever the Authority of the Book might be) the Place would be most im-

pertinently cited for your purpose ; for it is not of the Angels of the Churches which he speaks, but of those who stood round about the Throne of God, *Revelat. 7. 11*. As for Gregory, you do not tell us what Gregory you mean, and so you might as well have cited Cyril, or Alexander, or John, &c. As to your *Aretas*, I know him not. I know indeed that there was in the days of the Apostles one *Aretas* King of Arabia, and another formerly in the days of *Augustus Caesar* ; but I do not remember any of that Name among the Ecclesiastical Writers. It is true, there was one *Aretus* or *Aretius* Bishop of *Cesarea*, who is numbered among the Ecclesiastical Writers (who is said to be of the same Judgment with *Primasius* concerning the Angels of the seven Churches,) viz. That by the seven *Asian Churches*, all the rest of the Churches of Christ were represented, and so by their Angels the Governours of all the rest of the Churches, of which I find something insinuated though I cannot say very clearly) by *Primasius*. But I cannot see any thing that favours the collective Sense of the word *Angel*. And so, that the candid Reader may be enabled to judge of the Truth in that particular, I shall set down here the words of *Primasius* in his Commentary upon *Revelat. cap. 1*. which in the Original Latin are. *Septem stella Angeli sunt septem Ecclesiarum, sed & candelabra septem Ecclesie sunt: Stellas dixit Angelos Ecclesiarum & candelabra Ecclesias, que diligenter consideranda sunt. Si enim una est Ecclesia septiformis, sicut describitur, una est Columba mea, una est Perfecta mea; Angeli quoque non erunt septem: Nam si septem sunt istae sola quas specialiter nominavit, Angelos habent, ceterae non habent. Nec putandum est quod hoc loco Angeli singulis deputentur hominibus, quod incongrue ab aliquibus asinatur; sed potius Angeli Ecclesiarum intelligendi sunt Rectores populi, qui singulis Ecclesiis praesidentes, verbum vitae cunctis annunciant. Nam Angeli nomen multis interpretum dicitur. Which may be translated*

into

into English thus. The seven Stars are the Angels of the seven Churches, and the seven Candlesticks are the seven Churches. He said the Stars are the Angels of the Churches, and the Candlesticks are the Churches; which things are to be diligently considered: For, if the seven-formed Church be one, as it is described, My Dove is one. my Perfect (or undefiled) is one; the Angels likewise will not be seven; for if they are seven, those Churches which be hath specially named have Angels, and the rest have none. Neither is it to be thought, that the Names of Angels are ascribed unto every Man, as some have incongruously judged. But by the Angels of the Churches the Rulers of the People are rather to be understood, who, presiding over the several Churches, as God's Messengers, deliver the word of Life unto all; for the word Angel being interpreted signifies a Messenger.

Again in his Commentary upon the 2d cap. he saith, that the writing to the Angel of every Church, is the same thing, as if he had written to the Church it self, which he proveth from the first and general part of St. John's Commission cap. 1 where he is commanded to write what he should see in a Book, and send it to the seven Churches. By which he means that those Epistles which concerned the Churches, being directed to the several Angels or Rulers, it is the same thing upon the Matter, as if they had been directed to the Churches themselves. All which can make nothing for the collective Sense of the Word Angel. I confess that this Commentary of Primasius is so very obscure, that it doth rather darken than illuminate the Text; but I see nothing in it that can be said in the least to favour the collective Sense of the Word Angel, which was altogether unknown to the Ancients, being only a late Invention of the Champions for the Presbyterian Cause to support their novel Opinion. Among whom we may justly reckon those Schoolmen which you mention, being Popish Presbyterians, who are excluded from the Jurisdiction of Bishops by the Pope's Authority

thority: And in effect it is from those (who disputed in the Council of *Trent* against the divine Right of Episcopacy, that they might centre it in the Pope) from whom you derive the chief of those Arguments which you make use of against us. And, as it is certain that several of the Popish Regulars, are as irreconcilable Enemies to Bishops as you are, but especially the Jesuites (though they are content to embrace a Bishoprick as they have occasion) so it is plain that your Politicks and theirs are very near of Kin one to another.

I come now in the last place to consider those Testimonies of the Ancient Fathers, which you pretend to bring against the Apostolical Institution of Prelacy; but, before I enter upon that Subject, I think fit to advertise the Reader of the unaccountable Disingenuity of the Presbyterian Writers, who still insist upon those pretended Testimonies, without mentioning the solid Answers which have been often given unto them by those who have written in Defence of Episcopacy, and particularly by the Excellent Dr. *Pearson* Bp. of *Chester*, in his Vindication of *Ignatius*, unto which I refer both you and the Reader for your Satisfaction in that particular. But, because this my Answer may come into the Hands of many who cannot find Dr. *Pearson's* Book, I shall proceed to consider briefly the chief of those Testimonies which you object against the Apostolick Institution of Prelacy.

And so I begin with *Hierome* whom you judge to be one of the choicest of the Fathers, and whose Testimony (you say) is preferable to most of them: And you tell us, that he says expressly, that the Church was ruled *communi Presbyterorum consilio*, or by the common Advice and Counsel of Presbyters, without a Prelate over them. *Ans.* Though I incline not to detract any thing which is due to the Character of *Hierome*; yet I am far from thinking that he was either one of the choicest of the Fathers, or that his Testimony is preferable

able to most of them. It is true, he was one of the most Learned among the Fathers, and he was also of a very strict and austere Life; but he was of a crabbed and angry Temper, and frequently miscarried by Passion, so that sometimes such Expressions dropt from his Pen, as were neither agreeable to his Character nor to the Truth.

However we have no Reason to decline his Authority; for, as he makes no objection against Prelacy, so he plainly asserts the Power of Ordination to be proper to the Bishop as his peculiar Right; and that in his famed Epistle to *Evagrius*, where his Words are, *Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, Episcopus quod Presbyter non faciat*: That is, *What doth a Bishop which a Presbyter may not do, except Ordination?* And, if I did not study Brevity in this my Answer, I might bring several other clear Testimonies for Prelacy out of his Writings. And, although he seems indeed to suppose the original Identity of the Order of a Bishop and Presbyter, yet he doth evidently assert the Apostolical Institution of Prelacy, in that same Epistle to *Evagrius* before cited, where he saith, *Nam & Alexandria a Marco Evangelista usque ad Dionysium & Heraclam Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant*: That is, *For at Alexandria from Mark the Evangelist until Dionysius and Heraclas Bishops, the Presbyters did always name one chosen from among themselves and placed in an higher Degree to be their Bishop*. Where his Testimony for the Apostolick Institution of Prelacy is as clear as needs be. It is true, I confess, that he asserts a Bishop and Presbyter to be originally one and the same Order, which (as I shewed before) can yield no Advantage to your Cause. I confess also, that in his Commentary on the Epistle to *Titus*, cap. 1. he says, that in the Beginning Churches were ruled by the common Counsel of Presbyters; but it is plain from the very same place that his

his meaning is, that it was so only in the first Plantation of Churches, before they grew numerous, and Contentions began to arise among the Presbyters. His Words, as you set them down Page 42. are, *Before the Devil stirred up Divisions in the Church, the Churches were ruled by the common Counsel of Presbyters; but afterwards, for the remedying of Schism, it was decreed that one of the Presbyters should be set over the rest, to whom the whole Care of the Church should belong, &c.* Where you set down punctually that which you think makes for you, but cunningly omit that which doth not only take all the Advantage of the Testimony away from you, but also clearly establish it in Favours of us. And therefore I shall set down the whole Passage, as it is in the foresaid Commentary on *Tit. cap. 1.* in the original Latin: *Antequam Diaboli instigatu studia in religione fierent, & diceretur in populis, ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cephæ, communi Presbiterorum consilio Ecclesiæ gubernabantur: postquam vero unusquisque quos baptizaverat suos putabat esse, non Christi; in toto orbe decretum est ut unus de Presbiteris electus superponeretur ceteris, ad quem omnis Ecclesiæ cura pertineret. & schismatum semina tollerentur.* That is, *Before, by the instigation of the Devil, Parties began to be formed in Religion, and so he said among the People, I am of Paul, and I of Apollo, but I of Cephas, the Churches were ruled by the common Counsel of Presbyters; but after that every one began to suppose, that those whom he had baptized did belong to himself, and not to Christ; it was decreed throughout the whole World that one of the Presbyters being chosen, should be set over the rest, to whom all the care of the Church should pertain, and so the Seeds of Schism might be taken away.* And now let any Man of common Sense judge whether Hierome doth nor establish the Apostolick Institution of Episcopacy. I am sure there is very little Reason for your triumphing as you do, and labouring to promote so plain a Falshood, as that the Prelatists know not what to an-

swer

swer
far fr
Test
true
tion
by t
univ
possi
Auth
cont
crep
so th
fal
posi
strat
Alex
some
is ce
Mar
that
be t
Bish
orie
Spa
ceed
the
the
rech
Tra
Ch
abl
Bish
St.
aft
fis,
Ev
tut

ſwer to thoſe plain Teſtimonies: Whereas really we are ſo far from being ſtraitned what to answer, that, if thoſe Teſtimonies of *Hierome* be ſet down intire and in their true Light, they are ſo plain for the Apoſtolick Inſtitution of Prelacy, that, I think, they cannot be answered by the Presbyterians. For as his *ſoto orbe decretum*, or univerſal Decree throughout all the World, could not poſſibly proceed from any thing but the Apoſtolick Authority (as I have ſhewed before) and as it plainly contradicts your groundleſs Suppoſition, that Prelacy crept in by piece-meal and by ſtealth into the Church; ſo that *Hierome* underſtands the Change by this univerſal Decree to have been made in the Time of the Apoſtles (and ſo by the Apoſtles themſelves) is demonſtratively evident from his dating the Prelacy of *Alexandria* from St. Mark the Evangelist, and not ſome time after his Death (as you would have it;) which is contrary to the Words of *Hierome*, who makes St. Mark to be the *terminus a quo*, or the Term from which that Prelacy was dated: So that St. Mark behoved to be the firſt Biſhop (or at leaſt to have ſettled the firſt Biſhop there,) and accordingly we are told by the Hiſtories of the Church, that he ſat Biſhop there for the Space of 15 Years. *Eusebius* tells us that he was ſucceeded by *Amanus* in the Biſhoprick of *Alexandria* in the eighth Year of the Reign of *Nero*, and ſo moſt of all the Apoſtles lived after him. And although *Dorotheus* reckons his Martyrdom to have been in the Reign of *Trajan* (contrary to the reſt of the Hiſtories of the Church;) yet he ſuppoſeth it as a Thing unqueſtionable, that he had been for a conſiderable Time before Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and even according to his account, St. John the Apoſtle lived a good number of Years after him; ſo that, according to *Hierome's* Hypotheſis, dating the Prelacy of *Alexandria* from St. Mark the Evangelist, it is plain that it was of Apoſtolical Inſtitution. Which is farther evidently confirmed by that

Paſſage

Passage before cited out of his Epistle to *Evagrius*; *Et ut sciamus traditiones Apostolicas*, &c. Where he doth expressly call the Government of the Church by Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons an Apostolical Tradition.

But you object that *Hierome* says, the Difference betwixt a Bishop and a Presbyter, is *magis consuetudine quam Dominica Dispositionis veritate*: That is, Rather from Custom than the Truth of our Lord's Institution. *Ans.* He may be understood to say so, because he supposeth it was not instituted by our Lord while he was in the World, nor was there any express Institution of it recorded in the holy Scriptures, but that it was only appointed by the Apostles upon the Exigency of the Church before mentioned: For it is ordinary with the Fathers to call those Things by the Name of Ecclesiastical Customs which have no express Institutions recorded in Scripture, though they supposed them to have their Original from the Apostles, as might be shewed by many Instances; & I shall make clearly to appear in the Case of St. *Augustine* after mentioned. And this I think ought to be understood to be the Meaning of *Hierome* in the Passage before mentioned, and must certainly be so understood by all those who have so much Regard to his Reputation, as to allow him to be consistent with himself. And if this should not be allowed to be his meaning, it must be supposed to have been one of those Expressions which did inconsiderately and in Passion drop from his Pen; and so I leave those who will not admit that Sense of his Words to reconcile him unto himself: For the forementioned Evidence which he gives for the Apostolick Institution of Prelacy, cannot be taken away by it; especially seeing the Instance of deriving the Prelacy of *Alexandria* from St. *Mark* doth not lean only to his Testimony, but is delivered to us, not only by all the Ancient general Histories of the Church, but also by the particular History of the Church of *Alexandria* written by *Eutychius* Bishop of that

that See, as cited by Dr. *Scillingfleet* in his *Iren.* pag. 364, and by Bishop *Morton* in his *Episcopacy asserted.* pag. 51.

In the next place you tell us, that “ The Epistle to the *Magnesians* ascribed to *Ignatius* (as it is cited by Mr. *Turretine*) calls *πρεσβυτεριον* and the Administration of the Church by Presbyters Christ’s Law, because it was settled by the Apostles according to Christ’s will; but calls it a novel Institution which was in his Time advancing a Bishop above Presbyters.

Ans. It is truly very strange, how you or any of your Party can have the Confidence to alledge any Passage out of *Ignatius*’s Epistles for your Cause; seeing it must be very plain to every vulgar Reader of them, that they contain many and unanswerable Testimonies for Prelacy, which he speaks of every where, as of the Ordinance of God, that was fully settled in his Time: And if it was settled in his Time, it behoved to be from the Apostles (call it new or old, as you please) seeing he was contemporary with the Apostles, and did see Christ himself in the Flesh. And the Time that he wrote his Epistles was but a little after the Death of St. *John*; for we are told that he suffered Martyrdom in the 110 Year of Christ: *Euseb. in Chron. Hieron. de Script. Ecclesiast. Spondan. Epitom. in Ann. 110.* and St. *John* died in the 101. And so that which you say pag 30 of the Epistle to the *Magnesians*, being written about the Year 150. can have no Truth in it.

But that I may answer more directly to your Objection, though I acknowledge Mr. *Turretine* to be both a very judicious and learned Writer, and accordingly have a very considerable Regard for him, because of his learned Defence of the true Reformed Christian Religion against most of all its Enemies; yet I must say that this is not the only Instance wherein I have found him clenching in his Citation of the Fathers, for the Defence of those Doctrines which are peculiarly

maintained by his own Church, from which he is not at freedom to vary in any thing. And I must tell you farther, that it is not fair or ingenuous to insist upon those Passages which have been so often answered, without so much as mentioning those solid Answers that have been given unto them. However, that I may not be wanting here to clear any apparent Difficulty that may be in that Passage of Ignatius, according to your Representation of it, I shall set it down in- tire, 1st in the Original Greek, and then in Latin, according as it is rendered by the Ancient Latin Interpreter, and lastly in English also for the use of the vulgar Reader. First then in the Original Greek it is, *Ἐπεὶ ἐν ἡρώθλιω ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς διὰ Δάμα τὸ ἀξιοῦν ὑμῶν ἐπισκόπου, καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἀξίων Βάσσου καὶ Ἀπολλωνίου, καὶ τὸ συνδέειν με διακόνου Σωτίωνος, ὃ ἐγὼ ὀναίμην, ὅτι ὑποτάσσεται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς χάριτι Θεοῦ, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς νόμῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

Καὶ ὑμῖν ὃ πρέπῃ μὴ συγχράσθαι τῇ ἡδικίᾳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν Θεοῦ πάρος πάσαν ἐντροπλίᾳ αὐτῷ ἀπονέμειν, καθὼς ἔγγων καὶ τὸς ἀγίους πρεσβυτέρους, ὃ προσήληφότες τῷ φαινομένῳ νεοτερικῷ τάξιν, ἀλλ' ὡς φρονίμως ἐν Θεῷ συχωρεῖται αὐτῷ. Οὐκ αὐτῷ ὃ, ἀλλὰ τῷ πατρὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τῷ παντῶν ἐπισκόπῳ.

Which is thus rendered by the Ancient Latin Interpreter. *Quia igitur dignatus sum videre vos per Damas dignum Deo vestrum Episcopum, & Presbyteros dignos Bassum & Apollonium, & conservum meum diaconum Sotionem quo ego fruor; quoniam subiectus est Episcopo ut Gratia Dei, & Presbyterio ut legi Jesu Christi. Sed & vos decet non conti- nente Episcopi, sed secundum virtutem Dei patris omnem reverentiam ei tribuere (sicut agnovi & sanctos Presbyteros) non assumentes apparentem juniorem ordinem, sed ut prudentes in Deo concedentes ipsi; non ipsi vero, sed patri Jesu Christi omnium Episcopo. Which may be rendered in English thus, Seeing then I have been judged worthy to see you by Damas your Bishop worthy of God, and by your very worthy Presbyters Bassus and Apollonius, and by my*

Fellow

Fellow Servant Sotion your Deacon, whom may I enjoy, because he is subject to his Bishop, as to the Grace of God, and to the Presbytery as to the Law of Jesus Christ: Wherefore it will become you also not to use your Bishop too familiarly, because of his Youth; but to yield all Obedience to him, according to the Power of God the Father (as also I perceive that your holy Presbyters do) not considering his Age, which indeed, unto appearance, is young, (or not taking advantage of his appearing youthful Ordination,) but as becomes those who are prudent in God, submitting to him, or rather not unto him, but to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the Bishop of us all. Where I appeal to the candid Reader, whether there be any thing that favours Presbytery. The original Words which the Champions for your Cause take Advantage of, are νεωτερισμὸν τάξις, which they would have to be translated *Novel Order*; and I confess that they might be so translated, if the Context would agree with it. But here it cannot be so translated; for it is plain, that Ignatius is speaking of the youthful Age of their Bishop, he having been exhorting them immediately before, not to use him too familiarly because of his youthful Age: And so this Expression must be also understood of the same; for the Greek Word νεωτερισμός doth most properly signify *Youthful*; and so translating the Expression exactly according to the Letter of the Original, it is *Youthful Order or Ordination*: Which according to the Context is manifestly relative to the Youthfulness of his Age; so that in effect, this Passage can do no Service to your Cause: But, upon the contrary (if it be let down intire and without Mutilation, as I have done) it contains an eminent Testimony for Prelacy.

But farther, you say that “*Chrysostome and Theophy.*
 “*last on Philip. 1.* do tell us, that not only during the
 “*Apostles Lives, but in the Ages thereafter, the Names*
 “*of Bishop and Presbyter were not distinguished; and*

" this the first Writers after the Apostles do homologate, *Irenæus Bishop of Lions, &c.*

Ans. Whatsoever *Chrysostome* and *Theophylact* say concerning the Community of Names, yet they do plainly assert the Distinction of the Offices; for *St. Chrysostome* commenting on these Words, *With the Bishops and Deacons*, says, *Σὺν ἐπισκόποις, τὶ τούτο; μίας πόλεως πολλοὶ ἐπίσκοποι ἦσαν; ὁδισμαῶς, ἀλλὰ τῆς πρεσβυτερίας ὅτως ἐκάλεσε, καὶ διακόνος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐλέγετο.* Which in our Language is, *With the Bishops: What means that? Were there many Bishops in one City? Not at all: But he calls the Presbyters so; for as yet the Names were common, and a Bishop was called a Deacon also.* Where, though *St. Chrysostome* confesseth the Community of Names, yet he doth plainly assert the Distinction of the Offices, even in *St. Paul's* Time; and that there was never more than one Bishop in one City. So that this Passage of *St. Chrysostome*, instead of being for you, affords a very plain Testimony against you. And truly it is no Wonder that you run the same Fate with most of your Citations from the Fathers; seeing it is very certain that they knew nothing like Presbytery without a Bishop. And he who will go and seek any such thing among them, may as well seek for Fire under Water. And as to that which you say concerning *Irenæus Bishop of Lions*, his being called only a Presbyter in the Epistle of the *Gallican Martyrs*, it is of no Moment; seeing we do not deny that Bishops were frequently called Presbyters. And we have sufficient Evidence besides for demonstrating his Prelacy. But in effect *Dr. Pearson* hath sufficiently demonstrated (notwithstanding of *Mr. Blondel's* Chronology) that *Irenæus* was no more but a Presbyter at that Time, and that his Predecessor was still living and in the Possession of the Episcopal See of *Lions* when that Letter was written.

Again, you tell us of a Passage in the Epistle of *St. Clement* to the *Corinthians*, *Viz. That the Apostles went forth*

forth both in City and Country preaching and appointing the first Fruits of their Labours for Bishops and Deacons. From which you draw a threefold Conclusion; *Viz.* 1st. That it was usual for the Apostles to make Church Officers of the first Converts of those places where they planted Churches. Concerning which I shall not contend with you. 2^{ly}. You conclude, That St. Clement like St. Paul makes only two Orders of Church Officers of Divine Appointment. Unto which I answer, that I have spoken sufficiently already of those Church Officers which were made by St. Paul. And as to that of St. Clement, it can afford no reasonable Argument for you, seeing he is speaking of the very first Planting of the Churches by the Apostles, at which time it is no prejudice to the Episcopal Cause to say, that they ordained only two Orders; as I have shewed before: Though neither will that follow from this Passage of St. Clement, as you may see from the forementioned little Book written by Dr. Monro, pag. 44 and 45. But though St. Clement mentions only two Orders, as appointed by the Apostles in their first Planting of the Churches, yet we have in that same Epistle manifest Indications of a superior Order or Dignity to that of Presbyters; for we have him not only mentioning the ἡγούμενοι or Rulers, but Paragraph 40, we have him distributing those, of whom the Church is made up, into the chief Priest, the inferior Priests and Levites, with the Laity or Body of the People; and from thence exhorting every one (in the Beginning of the next Paragraph) to bless God in his proper Station, not exceeding the Rule of his Service that is appointed to him. 3^{ly}. You conclude, He shews it was ordinary in his time to plant Bishops in Villages as well as Cities. But as it is probable, that by Bishops in that Paragraph it is only Presbyters which are to be understood, so let you make of them what you will, you shall stand in need of a Cart-rope to draw in your Consequence; for certainly there is no Connexion

at all betwixt the Apostles preaching both in City and Country, and planting Bishops in both.

In the next place you say, that *Polycarp* in his Epistle to the *Philippians*, mentions only two Orders, viz. *Presbyters and Deacons*, &c. *Ans.* When *Polycarp* wrote that Epistle to the *Philippians*, it is probable that their Episcopal See was vacant, and so he had no Occasion to mention their Bishop: But it is plain, that *Polycarp* in the Inscription of the same Epistle, distinguisheth himself from the rest of the inferior Presbyters of *Smyna*; while he saith, *Polycarp and the Presbyters that are with him to the Church of God which is at Philippi.* Which we cannot think a Man of his Humility and Piety would have done, if he had not been placed in an higher Dignity than the rest.

But then you say, That the ancient Fathers of the first three Centuries do not plead for the Divine Institution of Prelacy. And you answer in our Name, that there was no Occasion for it, because it was not controverted at that time; which indeed was very true. And whereas you reply, that there was much Occasion for it, when some of *Cyprian's* Presbyters proved so rebellious against him: Surely you are much mistaken; for there was none of those rebellious Presbyters who did ever pretend any Quarrel with Prelacy, or called in Question the Authority of a Bishop; but they only complained, that they were injured by him, and so refused to submit to his Sentence, and appealed from it. And the first that ever made any Objection against the Authority of a Bishop duly and Canonically ordained, was *Aerius*.

But farther you tell us, that many of the most eminent of the Fathers acknowledge Episcopacy to be only an Ecclesiastical Constitution. And you instance *Ambrose* on *Ephes. 4.* *Augustine* in his 19th Epistle to *Hierome*, *Primas.* on 1 *Tim. 3.* *Basil. Magn. Constitut. Monast. cap. 22.* *Chrysostome* on 1 *Tim. 3.* *Sedulius, Hierome*

Hierome and *Isidore* Bishop of *Sevil* de *Ecclesiastic. Offic.* Among whom some seem only to favour the Identity of the Order (which, as I have told you before, can bring no advantage to your Cause, and which I am not resolved to meddle with in this Controversy betwixt you and me;) viz. *Primas. & Chrysost.* on *1 Tim. 2.* For as to that which you cite from *Basil. Mag. Constitut. Monast. Viz. That there was an equal Power committed to all Doctors or Bishops.* I see not what you can conclude from it, but that all Bishops are equal *jure Divino*; which we are ready to grant. It remains then that I should consider the rest of your Testimonies. And 1st. That of *Ambrose*, or rather *Pseudo-Ambrose*.

But whatsoever the Authority of the Author may be, his Testimony will not make much to your purpose; for he supposeth that the present Constitution of the Church in his time, did not in all things answer to the Writings of the Apostle; and he gives you the Reason, because those were written in the very first Beginnings (*inter ipsa primordia*) while the Church was yet but a planting. But when the Church was once constituted, he tells us the Case was altered; *tamen postquam omnibus locis Ecclesie sunt constituta, aliter composita res est quam ceperat.* Now all this is said without any prejudice to the Apostolick Institution of Episcopacy: For, 1st. As we do not assert that Episcopacy was generally constituted by the Apostles in the very first Beginnings of the Church, but only when the Churches in many Cities began to grow numerous, and accordingly Bishops were only planted in those Churches unto which *St. Paul* wrote his Epistles, after the Date of those Epistles; so we confess, that the Name of Bishop was not at first appropriated, as it was in the time when that Author wrote his Commentaries: And so the Constitution of the Church at that time might be truly said, not to answer in all things to the Writings of the Apostle; and yet without any prejudice to the
the

the Apostolick Institution of Episcopacy, which was afterward settled by them.

In the next place, I come to the Testimony of St. *Augustine* in his 19 *Epist.* to *Hierome*. Where his words are ; *Quaquam enim secundum honorum vocabula quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, Episcopatus Presbyterio major sit, tamen in multis rebus Augustinus Hieronymo minor est.* In English thus, *Although according to the words of Honour which the Custom of the Church hath now obtained, the Office of a Bishop be greater than that of a Presbyter, yet in many things Augustine is less than Hierome.* Now for Answer to this, it is to be considered, that St. *Augustine* there is complimenting *Hierome*, and endeavouring so to smoothe and calm the crabbed Temper of the old Man, as he might be encouraged, not only with all possible Freedom, but also with a due Calmness and Composure of Spirit, to exchange Epistles with him, about the Interpretation of some dark Places of Scripture (for *Jerome* had written very passionately to St. *Augustine* a little before) and therefore he labours to level and put himself, as much as could be, in Equality with *Hierome*. And so he sets forth his Episcopal Dignity in the most extenuating Terms that he could do with any measure of Truth, following that Opinion which he knew *Hierome* had published concerning it : But in regard (as I shewed before) it is plain that *Hierome's Consuetudo* must be understood of an Apostolical Constitution continued uniformly in the Church, so St. *Augustine's usus Ecclesiæ* must be understood of an universal Practice of the Church, deriving its Original from the Apostles ; for seeing his words will sufficiently bear this, it is unreasonable to interpret them otherwise, it being manifest that he designed to extenuate his Character as much as he could do with any colour of Truth ; and also that he doth call other things by the Name of the Customs of the Church, which nevertheless he supposeth to derive their Original

nal from the Apostles, *de Baptism. cont. Donatist. lib. 3. cap. 7. and Lib. 4. cap. 24. and Lib. 5. cap. 23.*

In the third place, as to your Testimony from *Sedulius*, I suppose your Author hath mistaken him who lived in the 5th for him who lived in the 8th Century (if we may believe Dr. Mackenzie's account of the Scotch Writers ;) for to tell the Truth, I am not well acquainted with any of the two : But seeing you tell us that he foundeth his Testimony on *Act. 20.* I am apt to think that in answering to that place of Scripture (as I have done before) I may have also sufficiently answered to his Testimony. I have also answered the Testimony of *Hierome*, without being in the least confounded with the Evidence of it, as you would have the World believe.

It remains then, that I should now consider the Testimony of *Isidore Bishop of Sevil* in his Book *de Ecclesiast. Offic.* Whole words are. *Hic, (vix. Presbyteris) sicut Episcopis Dispensatio mysteriorum Dei commissa est ; præsunt enim Ecclesiis Christi, & in confectioe corporis & sanguinis consortes cum Episcopis sunt, similiter in doctrina Populi, & officio prædicandi ; sed sola propter auctoritatem summo Sacerdoti Clericorum ordinatio reservata est, ne a multis Ecclesiæ disciplina vindicata concordiam solveret, scandala generaret.* That is ; To them as unto the Bishops the Dispensation of the Mysteries of God is committed ; They are also set over the Churches of Christ in like manner, in instructing the People and in the Office of Preaching ; But for the greater Authority of the chief Priest, the Ordination of the Clergy is reserved to him alone, lest, if the discipline of the Church should be assumed by many, it might dissolve the Peace of the Church and beget Scandals. Where, I confess, he seems to favour the Original Identity of the Order : But there can be nothing concluded from his Testimony against the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy ; for he does not say, that the Reservation, which he mentions, was not first made by the Apostles. But that I may dissemble nothing, which, with any vori-

fimilitude, may be objected against our Cause, the Testi-
 mony of the 2d. Council of Sevil (wherein *Isidore* was
 present) seems to be more pat to your Purpose. Which
 (upon the occasion of some Irregularities committed by
 certain Presbyters ordained by *Agapius* Bishop of *Cordu-*
ba) hath those Words ; *Nam quamvis cum Episcopis plu-*
rima illis ministeriorum communis sit dispensatio, quaedam
novellis & Ecclesiasticis regulis sibi prohibita noverint, sicut
Presbyterorum & Diaconorum & virginum consecratio, &c.
 That is. *Although they (viz. The Presbyters before*
mentioned have in many Things the Dispensation of the Sa-
cred Ministrations in common with the Bishops, yet let
them know that some Things are forbidden them by Novel
and Ecclesiastical Rules ; such as the Consecration of Pres-
byters, Deacons and Virgins, &c. Now for Answer: Al-
 though it cannot be denied that this Council supposes
 the Identity of the Order, and that the Presbyters had
 an original Right to do all those Things ; yet it will
 not follow that they thought the Restraint concerning
 every one of those Things mentioned, was from those
 Novel Ecclesiastical Constitutions ; for the Council
 mentions a Number of those Things together, some of
 which were more early, and some more lately restrained
 from the Presbyters. But in regard that some of them
 were truly of a late Date, and that the Restraint of those
 which were more ancient, was confirmed together with
 them by those Novel Ecclesiastical Constitutions, there-
 fore the Restraint of all is said to be by Novel Ecclesia-
 stical Rules. And that this ought to be judged to be
 the meaning of the Council, I think we must necessarily
 conclude ; because we cannot suppose them to be igno-
 rant that the Power of Ordination was restrained from
 Presbyters many Hundreds of Years before their Time.
 And if you will say that this manner of Speaking is not
 very agreeable, I answer, that although I doubt not but
 it might have been more clearly expressed by putting
 a Difference, yet, as there are greater Difficulties to be
 found in the Expressions of many other Authors,

39
so let them, who design to defend the Honour of the Council, look to that ; for if this Interpretation be not admitted, their Assertion must certainly be false, seeing the ancient Records of the Church make it as clear as the Sun at Noon Day, that the Power of Ordination was restrained from Presbyters many Hundreds of Years before the Time of this Council, which sat only in the 7th Century : About which Time an Ecclesiastical Constitution (though but of a present Date) began to be esteemed as Sacred as if it had been Apostolical. And truly, if *Hierome* had thought that the fore-mentioned Restraint had not been from the Apostles, we cannot reasonably doubt but he would have mentioned the Novelty of it, when his Passion transported him so far, as to say, *That Bishops were greater than Presbyters, more by Custom than the Truth of our Lord's Institution*; of which I have spoken before.

But there remains one of your Fathers yet to be considered (whom I must not pass over,) and it is *Gregory Nazianzen*, with whose Testimonies you make a great Deal of Noise, though really they can do you as little Service as any of the rest. Now those Testimonies which you cite from him, are of two kinds, viz. 1. His wishing Prelacy to be abolished from *Orat. 28.* which you mention in two several Places of your Book, viz. page 32. Where you say, *If the Ancients had believed the divine Right of Prelacy, would Gregory Nazianzen have lamented the Being of it, and so pathetically wished for its Abolition.* And Page 50. Where you cite his Words thus, *Would to God there were no Prelacy nor tyrannical Privileges, that by Vertue only we might be discerned: But now Contentions about the right and left Hand, about the higher and lower Place, have bred many Inconveniencies among Ministers that should be Teachers in Israel.* Now the *Basil Edition*, which I had of *Greg. Nazianzen's Works*, having nothing in it like this in the 28 *Oration* obliged me to search other two Editions, viz. at *Col. Agrip. 1570.* and that by *Mo.*

rollus at Paris Anno 1630. From which I believe your
 Author hath drawn his Citation, that *Oration* being
 quite differently placed in the other two Editions.
 And therefore, seeing the several Editions vary so
 much in placing of the *Orations*, you should have
 told us the Edition, as well as the Number of the *O-
 ration*. But to let that pass, the Words of St. *Grego-
 ry Nazianzen* will do no Service to your Cause; see-
 ing it is plain, that it is not the Prelacy of Bishops over
 Presbyters, but of a Bishop over Bishops of which he
 speaks, and of their Tyranny and Vanity of which he
 complains. The Apostles had settled Prelacy in the
 Church (as I have shewed before) and that as neces-
 sary for preserving Unity in the Fountains; but they
 ordained no Superiority among Bishops, but left them
 in a perfect Equality; as we have not only St. *Cy-
 prian* teaching in *Orat. ad Concil. Carthagin.* but also
 your Man *Hierome* in his famed Epistle to *Evagr.* be-
 fore mentioned, where his Words are. *Ubi-
 que sit Episcopus, five Romæ, five Eugubii, five Constanti-
 nopoli, five Rhegii, five Alexandriæ, five Tanis, ejus-
 dem meriti est & Sacerdotii potentia; divitiarum & pauper-
 tatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum
 non facit: ceterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt.*
 That is, *Wheresoever a Bishop shall be, whether at Rome,
 or Eugubium, or at Constantinople, or Rhegium, or at
 Alexandria, or Tanis, he is of the same Merit and Priest-
 hood; the Power of Riches and the Humility of Poverty doth
 not make a Bishop higher or lower; but they are all the
 Successors of the Apostles.* Where, as we have a plain
 Testimony for the Parity of Bishops, so there cannot
 be any thing more lofty said of Episcopacy. Now
 this Parity which the Apostles had left among the Bi-
 shops, the Church was pleased to alter, thinking it fit
 to model her Policy according to that of the Empire.
 But as this was not very agreeable to the Church of
 Christ, so the Event hath shewed it to have been a
 piece of the greatest Folly; for this very thing was the
 Origin

Original of innumerable Mischiefs, the great Sacer-
 dor, Riches and Power of the Patriarchal and
 political See having corrupted the Minds of Men
 with Pride, Ambition and worldly Mindedness, and by an
 inordinate desire of Rule and Dominion, prompted
 them to Tyranny and many other Evils. And this
 was indeed the very thing that paved the way unto the
 Papacy and Antichristian Tyranny, and not the Pre-
 lacy of Bishops over Presbyters, as you plead.

For to say that this Apostolical Prelacy paved the
 way to Popery, because there could have been no Pope
 if there had been no Bishop, is very unreasonable;
 and the same Conclusion may be drawn from the In-
 stitution of a Presbyter: For it is as true, that, if there
 had been no Presbyter, there could have been no
 Pope; and if the Apostolical Institution of Episcopal
 Parity had been observed, it would have as effectually
 barred all Pretences to the Papacy, as Presbyterian
 Parity could have done.

But to return to the forementioned Testimony of
 Gregory Nazianzen, I must here again accuse your Par-
 ty of *Disingenuity*, telling every Man of common
 Sense who reads this *Oration*, and considers the occa-
 sion of it, most plainly see that he speaks of the Pre-
 lacy of Bishops over Bishops, and not of the Prelacy
 of Bishops over Presbyters. And therefore, that I
 may clear this unto the Reader, I shall first shew the
 occasion of this *Oration*, and then set down the whole
 Passage, first in the Original Greek, and then as it is
 rendred in Latin by the Interpreter of the *Parisian*
 Edition (which I suppose your Author made use of) and
 lastly render it in English for the use of the vulgar Reader.

First then, as to the Occasion of this *Oration*, Gre-
 gory Nazianzen having been advanced to the Metropo-
 litical See of *Constantinople* (which next to *Rome* was
 the greatest Ecclesiastical Promotion in the World) did
 entertain a particular Friendship with one *Maximus* a
 Cynick Philosopher, who had turned Christian, keep-
 ing

ing him in his own House, and admitting him to the nearest Familiarity with himself. But this Ungrateful and Wicked Man (taking occasion from the Absence of ~~St. Gregory~~ in the Country) endeavoured by sinister means to get himself raised to the See of Constantinople, and to exclude his Friend and Patron from it; and so having convened a certain number of Egyptian Bishops whom he had bribed for that purpose, while they were going to elect him, there arose such an Uproar among the People (who stuck close to their lawful Bishop) that the pretended Electors were forced to quit the Church, and betake themselves to a private House for doing of their Business. In the mean time Gregory, having received an account of all this from his Friends at Constantinople, returned and made this Oration to the People, from which you cite the forementioned Passage. The words of it in the Original Greek are,

Δια τὴν ἐνέσθαι προεδρίας ἀποσπῆσαι; ἢν, πότε, καὶ
τις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἐθαύμασε; νῦν δὲ καὶ τὸ θεύγειν
ὡς γὰρ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ πρῶτον συνέσει, δι' ἣν πάντα δοκεῖται,
καὶ σίαντες τὰ ἡμέτερα; καὶ τὰ τε σέβαστα τὰ οἰκουμενικῆς
ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ πολέμου, καὶ τὴν καὶ ἐπὶ ὄνομα ἔχοντι.
δι' ἣν καὶ κινδυνεύομεν ἀνθρώπων εἶναι, ὅσα θεῶν γεγονότες,
καὶ τὸ μέγα καὶ καὶνὸν ἀποβαλεῖν ὄνομα. ὡς ὁφείλον γὰρ
μηδὲ ἢ προεδρία, μηδὲ τις τῶν προκείμεναι καὶ τυραν-
νικῇ προνομίᾳ, ἢ ἔχει μόνον ἐχθροσκόμους. Νῦν δὲ
τὸ δεξιὸν τῦτο καὶ τὸ ἀριστερόν, καὶ τὸ μέσον, καὶ τὸ ὑ-
ψυλότερον, καὶ τὸ χαμαλιότερον, καὶ τὸ προβαδίζειν
ἢ συμβαδίζειν, πολλὰ πέποικε τὰ συντρίμματα ἡμῶν
ἀνακλῶν καὶ πολλὰς ἐκ βόθρου ὥστε καὶ εἰς τὴν τῶν ἐπι-
στολῶν χάριτος ἐπέλαυνεν. Ὅσα ἡμεῖς μόνον, ἀλλ' ἦσαν καὶ τῶν
προσώπων, οἱ διδασκαλοὶ καὶ κληρικοὶ οἵτις, ἰαυτὰ ἠγρόνσαν.

The Latin Interpreter of the forementioned Parisian Edition renders it thus, *Primariam sedis dignitatem nobis eripient? Quam prudentem quāquam etiam admiratus est, nunc autem eam fugere, ut mihi quidam videtur, prima & singularis est prudentie. Propter hanc enim omnes res nostra jactantur & concutiantur: Propter hanc fines ex his terra suspitione & villo flagrant, eoque surdo quodam modo*

modo ad hoc nomen quidem habent. Propter hoc periculum
 est ne qui a Deo creati sumus, hominum similes, ad imaginem
 illud & novum nomen amittamus. Utinam autem nihil
 quidem sedis principatus esset, nec ulla loci pretentio, &
 tyrannica prerogativa, ut ex sola virtute cognoscatur. Nunc
 autem dextrum hoc, & sinistrum, ac medium latet, & subse-
 nior atque inferior gradus, & praeferre & subesse debet,
 multas nobis contritiones intus pepererunt, & multas in
 foveam impulerunt, atque ad haecorum regionem adduxerunt,
 non plebeiorum tantum, sed etiam pastorum, qui cum laici-
 stri Israelis essent, hac ignorarunt. Which we may render
 into English thus. Shall they violently take from us the
 Dignity of the chief See? which sometime even some of those
 who were prudent did admire. But now it seems unwisdom to
 be a prime and singular piece of Prudence to flee from it.
 Upon the account of it, are all my Affairs tossed and shaken
 together; upon the account of it, the ends of the World do
 flame with War and Jealousy, and that such as is in a manner
 deaf, and hath not so much as a Name; upon the account of it
 there is danger, lest we who were begotten of God, should perish
 only to Men, and should lose that great and new Name.
 Would to God there had been no Primacy among the Episcopal
 Sees, nor Prelacy belonging to any Place, neither tyrannical
 Prerogative; that by Virtue only we might be discerned. But
 now the Right, and Left, and middle Station, the higher
 and lower Degree, the going before and going together
 have in vain bred many Troubles to us, and have
 thrust many into the Ditch, and have led them away into the
 Region of Goats; and that not only of the common sort, but
 even of Pastors, who, though they were Mission in Israel, were
 ignorant of those things. Now considering this whole
 Passage, together with the Occasion of it, it must be clear
 as the Light to every vulgar Reader, That the thing which
 St. Gregory complains of, and wishes to be abolished, is the
 Prelacy of Bishops over Bishops, and the vast Prerogatives
 of the Metropolitans, and not the Apostolical Prerogative
 of Bishops over Presbyters in the several Churches; and con-
 sequently how little reason there is for all the Noise you
 make with it, which can only serve to deceive or amuse
 ignorant People, but must necessarily expose your Disinge-
 nuity unto those of greater knowledge.

Again

I have now having answered your Letter, and established the Apocatastasis
 In-
 fecting Society, both from Scripture and unchangeable Reason; and vindicating
 them from the most considerable of your Charges, allow me to return your
 Acknowledgments with your self, and to intreat, that, feeling you have made
 yourself into a Scholar, and of the worst Consequence into the part of the
 Church of Christ, you may be pleased to lay it to Heart and put an end
 to it, by performing your Duty, or at least that you may be pleased to
 make the Church of Peace, and write to the substance of our Conversation
 which is certainly a good deal. And if there be any thing in the Circumstances
 of it which are offensive to you (such as the manner of Election, and too
 great a number of the Bishops, together with their meddling too much
 in secular Affairs) perhaps you may prevail with the King and Parliam.
 to remove them altogether, for we desire to have those Things rectified as
 well as you. And if you be truly sincere for the Glory of God and the Good
 of his Church (as you pretend) I am sure you want not the most powerful
 Motives to it: But you will still persecute your Schism, and continue your
 bitter and bloody animosity. I desire you may not only consider the In-
 fluence of all your Schisms, but also how selfish may be what God so punish
 our schismatic and persecuting Churches about those latter Matters, as he
 did of the Opprobrium of the Novatian Schism by the prevailing of the
 Arianism. For every sect and heresy are another (saith the Apostle)
 which shall be to us as a stumbling stone of another. Which, I pray, God of
 his Mercy may be pleased to remove. Farewell.

